arXiv:1508.06246v2 [math.AP] 26 Aug 2015

SPREADING IN A SHIFTING ENVIRONMENT MODELED BY THE DIFFUSIVE LOGISTIC EQUATION WITH A FREE BOUNDARY

YIHONG DU[†], LEI WEI[‡] AND LING ZHOU[§]

Abstract. We investigate the influence of a shifting environment on the spreading of an invasive species through a model given by the diffusive logistic equation with a free boundary. When the environment is homogeneous and favourable, this model was first studied in Du and Lin [12], where a spreading-vanishing dichotomy was established for the long-time dynamics of the species, and when spreading happens, it was shown that the species invades the new territory at some uniquely determined asymptotic speed $c_0 > 0$. Here we consider the situation that part of such an environment becomes unfavourable, and the unfavourable range of the environment moves into the favourable part with speed $c > 0$. We prove that when $c \geq c_0$, the species always dies out in the long-run, but when $0 < c < c_0$, the long-time behavior of the species is determined by a trichotomy described by (a) *vanishing*, (b) *borderline spreading*, or (c) *spreading*. If the initial population is writen in the form $u_0(x) = \sigma\phi(x)$ with ϕ fixed and $\sigma > 0$ a parameter, then there exists $\sigma_0 > 0$ such that vanishing happens when $\sigma \in (0, \sigma_0)$, borderline spreading happens when $\sigma = \sigma_0$, and spreading happens when $\sigma > \sigma_0$.

1. Introduction

The effect of climate change on the survival of ecological species has attracted a great deal of attention in recent years; see, for example, [3, 4, 5, 6, 22] and the references therein. To gain insights to this problem, some simple mathematical models have been proposed and analyzed. One such model is given by the Cauchy problem

$$(1.1) \qquad u_t = du_{xx} + f(x-ct, u),\ x \in \mathbb{R}^1, t > 0;\ u(0,x) = u_0(x),\ x \in \mathbb{R}^1,$$

where $u(t,x)$ stands for the population density of the concerned species at time t and spatial position x, with initial population $u_0(x)$. The climate change is incorperated in the function $f(x-ct,u)$, which describes a changing environment that shifts with a certain speed $c > 0$. In [3, 4, 5, 6], the situation where a shifting environment with a favourable habitat range surrounded by unfavorable ones is investigated, and many interesting results are obtained, including useful criteria for long-time survival of the species.

Date: August 27, 2015.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35K20, 35R35, 35J60, 92B05.

Key words and phrases. diffusive logistic equation, free boundary, spreading, invasive population, shifting environment.

[†] School of Science and Technology, University of New England, Armidale, NSW 2351, Australia. Email: ydu@turing.une.edu.au.

[‡] School of Mathematics and Statistics, Jiangsu Normal University, Xuzhou 221116, China. Email: wlxznu@163.com.

[§] School of Mathematical Science, Yangzhou University, Yangzhou 225002, China. Email: zhoul@yzu.edu.cn.

Y. Du was supported by the Australian Research Council, L. Wei was supported by NSFC (11271167), and L. Zhou was supported by NSFC (11401515).

In [22], the influence of climate change on the spreading of an invasive species is studied, where the problem is modeled by (1.1) with a logistic type nonlinear term

$$f(x-ct,u)=r(x-ct)u-u^2,$$

and to represent a shifting environment, $r(\xi)$ is assumed to be a continuous increasing function with $r(\pm\infty)$ finite and $r(-\infty)<0<r(+\infty)$. So there is a $\xi_0\in\mathbb{R}^1$ such that $r(\xi)\leq 0$ for $\xi<\xi_0$ and $r(\xi)>0$ for $\xi>\xi_0$, indicating that the shifting range $\Omega_t^-:=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^1: x<\xi_0+ct\}$ is unfavourable to the species, while $\Omega_t^+:=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^1: x>\xi_0+ct\}$ is favourable. The main result in [22] states that, if the environment shifting speed c is strictly greater than $c^*:=2\sqrt{dr(+\infty)}$, then the species will die out in the long run, while in the case $0<c<c^*$, the species will survive and spread into new territory in the direction of the moving environment with asymptotic speed c^*. More precisely, in the case $0<c<c^*$, for any given small $\epsilon>0$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\sup_{x\leq(c-\epsilon)t}u(t,x)\right]=0,\ \lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\sup_{x\geq(c^*+\epsilon)t}u(t,x)\right]=0,$$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\sup_{(c+\epsilon)t\leq x\leq(c^*-\epsilon)t}|u(t,x)-r(+\infty)|\right]=0.$$

Therefore, in the case $c<c^*$, the species will survive only inside the shifting range $S_t:=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^1: ct<x<c^*t\}$ for large t.

In this paper we look at a similar problem to [22], but use a free boundary to describe the spreading front of the species. As a matter of fact, we started working on the problem independently of [22], and learned of [22] only after the first draft of our paper has been completed. It is a pleasing surprise to us that the nonlinear term in our model almost coincides with that used in [22], which made the results arising from the two related models readily comparable (see below, in particular Remark 1.3 (ii)).

We now describe our model precisely. Let $c>0$ be as before. We assume that $A(\xi)$ is a Liptschitz continuous function on $\mathbb{R}^1$ satisfying

$$A(\xi)=\begin{cases}a_0, & \xi<-l_0,\\ a, & \xi\geq 0,\end{cases}\tag{1.2}$$

and $A(\xi)$ is strictly increasing over $[-l_0,0]$. Here l_0, a_0 and a are constants, with $l_0>0$, $a_0\leq 0$ and $a>0$.

Our model is given by the following free boundary problem

$$\begin{cases}u_t=du_{xx}+A(x-ct)u-bu^2, & t>0,\quad 0<x<h(t),\\ u_x(t,0)=u(t,h(t))=0, & t>0,\\ h'(t)=-\mu u_x(t,h(t)), & t>0,\\ h(0)=h_0,\ u(0,x)=u_0(x), & 0\leq x\leq h_0,\end{cases}\tag{1.3}$$

where $x=h(t)$ is the moving boundary to be determined, h_0, μ,d,b are positive constants, and the initial function $u_0(x)$ satisfies

$$u_0\in C^2([0,h_0]),\ u_0'(0)=u_0(h_0)=0,\ u_0'(h_0)<0\text{ and }u_0>0\text{ in }[0,h_0).\tag{1.4}$$

So in this model, the range of the species is the varying interval $[0,h(t)]$, and the species can invade the environment from the right end of the range ($x=h(t)$), with speed propotional to the population gradient u_x there, while at the fixed boundary $x = 0$, a no-flux boundary condition is assumed. The function $A(x-ct)$ represents the assumption that the unfavourable part of the environment is moving into the current and future habitat of the species at the speed c. We want to know the long-time dynamical behavior of $u(t,x)$.

In the case that $A(x-ct)$ is replaced by a positive constant a (the same as in (1.2)), so the species is spreading in a favourable homogeneous environment, problem (1.3) was studied in [12], where a spreading-vanishing dichotomy was established. (See also [13, 14] for a more systematic investigation of similar free boundary models in homogeneous environment of one space dimension.) Moreover, in the case of spreading, it is shown in [7, 16] that there exists $c_0 = c_0(\mu)$ such that $h(t) - c_0 t$ converges to some constant as $t \to +\infty$, and

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\le x\le h(t)}\left|u(t,x) - q_{c_0}(h(t)-x)\right|\right] = 0,$$

where $(c_0, q_{c_0}(\xi))$ is uniquely determined by

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} dq_{c_0}'' - c_0 q_{c_0}' + a q_{c_0} - b q_{c_0}^2 = 0,\ q_{c_0} > 0 \text{ for } \xi > 0;\\ q_{c_0}(0) = 0,\ q_{c_0}(+\infty) = a/b,\ \mu q_{c_0}'(0) = c_0. \end{array}\right. \tag{1.5}$$

Moreover, c_0 is increasing in μ and $\lim_{\mu\to+\infty} c_0(\mu) = 2\sqrt{ad}$ (see [7]). For comparison, let us remark that if one takes $r(\xi) = A(\xi)$ in [22], then the constant c^* in the earlier discussions takes the value $2\sqrt{ad}$, which is the asymptotic spreading speed of an invading species determined by (1.1) with the classical Fisher-KPP nonlinear term $f = au - bu^2$ (see [2, 18, 20]).

Using the techniques of [12], it is easily seen that (1.3) has a unique (classical) solution, which is defined for all $t > 0$. The long-time dynamical behavior of the pair $(u(x,t), h(t))$ is given by the following two theorems.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (u,h) be the unique positive solution of (1.3). Suppose that $0 < c < c_0$. Then exactly one of the following happens:*

(i) Vanishing: $\lim_{t\to\infty} h(t) = h_\infty < +\infty$ *and*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\le x\le h(t)} u(t,x)\right] = 0.$$

(ii) Spreading: $\lim_{t\to\infty} h(t)/t = c_0$, *and for any small* $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{(c+\epsilon)t\le x\le(1-\epsilon)h(t)}\left|u(t,x) - a/b\right|\right] = 0,\ \lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\le x\le(c-\epsilon)t} u(t,x)\right] = 0.$$

(iii) Borderline Spreading: $\lim_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = L_*$, *and*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\le x\le h(t)}\left|u(t,x) - V_*(x - h(t) + L_*)\right|\right] = 0,$$

where $L_* > -l_0$ and $V_*(x)$ are uniquely determined by

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} dV_*'' + cV_*' + A(x)V_* - bV_*^2 = 0,\ V_* > 0 \quad \text{for } x \in (-\infty, L_*),\\ V_*(-\infty) = V_*(L_*) = 0,\ -\mu V_*'(L_*) = c. \end{array}\right. \tag{1.6}$$

If the initial function in (1.3) has the form $u_0(x) = \sigma\phi(x)$ with some fixed ϕ satisfying (1.4) and $\sigma > 0$ a parameter, then we will show that there exists $\sigma_0 \in (0, +\infty]$ such that vanishing happens for $\sigma \in (0, \sigma_0)$, spreading happens for $\sigma > \sigma_0$, and borderline spreading happens for $\sigma = \sigma_0$. Simple sufficient conditions can be found to guarantee that $\sigma_0 < +\infty$. The detailed statements of these results can be found in Section 4 below.

If $c \geq c_0$, we show that vanishing always happens, as indicated in the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *If* $c \geq c_0$*, then* $\lim_{t\to\infty} h(t) = h_\infty < +\infty$ *and*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\leq x\leq h(t)} u(t,x)\right] = 0.$$

Remark 1.3. (i) In Theorem 1.1 case (ii), it is possible to use the techniques of [16] to show that $\lim_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - c_0 t]$ exists and is finite, and

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{(c+\epsilon)t\leq x\leq h(t)} \left|u(t,x) - q_{c_0}(h(t)-x)\right|\right] = 0.$$

To avoid the paper becoming too long, we have refrained from doing this here.

(ii) Compared with the phenomena revealed in [22] by using (1.1), our Theorem 1.1 above captures some more varied long-time dynamical behaviors of the species for the case $0 < c < c_0$. For the case $c \geq c_0$, our result here (Theorem 1.2) is paralelle to that for the case $c > c^*$ in [22].

(iii) It is interesting to note that in the case of favourable homogeneous environment considered in [12], the long-time dynamical behavior of the species is governed by a spreading-vanishing dichotomy, while in the case of Theorem 1.1, the long-time dynamical behavior is determined by a trichotomy. Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 together clearly indicate that changing environments cause fundamental changes to the behavior of affected ecological species.

(iv) The trichotomy in Theorem 1.1 is similar in spirit to one of the main results in [19], where a free boundary problem with advection is considered in a homogeneous environment.

There are several recent related work on the free boundary model in spatially inhomogeneous environment (mostly for one space dimension or in a setting with spherical symmetry). In [11], the case of periodic spatial environment is studied. Other types of heterogeneous spatial environments are considered in [21, 25, 26]. In [10, 23], time-periodic environments are considered. See also the survey [9] for some further related research.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give the existence and uniqueness result for (1.3), as well as results on several auxiliary elliptic problems, which will be used for proving the main results later. Section 3 is the main part of the paper, where we prove Theorem 1.1 through various comparison arguments, based on the construction of super-subsolutions, and on suitable applications of a zero number result of Angenent [1] in several key steps. In Section 4, we examine how the long-time dynamical behavior of (1.3) changes as the initial function is varied. Section 5, the final section, constitutes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

2. Preliminary results

2.1. **Existence and uniqueness.**

The following local existence and uniqueness result can be proved by the contraction mapping theorem as in [12].

Theorem 2.1. (Local existence) *For any given* u_0 *satisfying* (1.4) *and any* $\alpha \in (0,1)$*, there is a* $T > 0$ *such that problem* (1.3) *admits a unique positive solution*

$$(u,h) \in C^{(1+\alpha)/2,1+\alpha}(D_T) \times C^{1+\alpha/2}([0,T]);$$

moreover,

$$\|u\|_{C^{(1+\alpha)/2,1+\alpha}(D_T)} + \|h\|_{C^{1+\alpha/2}([0,T])} \le C,$$

where $D_T = \{(t,x) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \in [0,h(t)],\ t \in [0,T]\}$, C *and* T *only depend on* h_0, α *and* $\|u_0\|_{C^2([0,h_0])}$.

To show that the local solution obtained in Theorem 2.1 can be extended to all $t > 0$, as in [12], the following estimates are useful.

Lemma 2.2. *Let* (u,h) *be a positive solution to problem* (1.3) *defined for* $t \in (0,T_0)$ *for some* $T_0 \in (0,+\infty]$. *Then there exist constants* C_1 *and* C_2 *independent of* T_0 *such that*

$$0 < u(t,x) \le C_1,\ \ 0 < h'(t) \le C_2 \ \ \text{for } 0 \le x < h(t) \text{ and } t \in (0,T_0).$$

Using Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we can prove the following global existence result.

Theorem 2.3. (Global existence) *The solution of problem* (1.3) *is defined for all* $t \in (0,\infty)$.

We omit the proofs of these results as they are easy modifications of those in [12].

2.2. **Some auxiliary elliptic problems.** In this subsection, we study several elliptic problems for later use. In particular we will prove the existence and uniqueness of (L_*, V_*) appearing in (1.6).

Let $c_0 = c_0(\mu)$ and $q_{c_0}(\xi)$ be given in (1.5). We assume throughout this subsection that

$$0 < c < c_0.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Assume* $C \in [0, 2\sqrt{ad}\,)$. *Then for all large* $l > 0$, *the problem*

$$dw'' + Cw' + aw - bw^2 = 0 \text{ for } -l < x < l,\ w(-l) = w(l) = 0 \tag{2.1}$$

admits a unique positive solution $w_l(x)$. *Moreover,* $\lim_{l\to\infty} w_l(x) = \frac{a}{b}$ *uniformly in any compact subset of* $\mathbb{R}^1$, *and*

$$\lim_{l\to+\infty} w_l'(l) = -C/\mu_C,$$

where $\mu_C > 0$ *is uniquely determined by* $c_0(\mu_C) = C$.

Proof. We define

$$\lambda = \frac{C}{\sqrt{ad}} \quad \text{and} \quad v(x) = \frac{b}{a} e^{\frac{\lambda}{2}x} w\Big(\sqrt{\frac{d}{a}}x\Big).$$

Then (2.1) is changed to the equivalent problem

$$\begin{cases} -v'' = (1-\frac{\lambda^2}{4})v - e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}x}v^2 & \text{for } -\tilde{l} < x < \tilde{l}, \\ v(-\tilde{l}) = v(\tilde{l}) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

with

$$\tilde{l} := \sqrt{\frac{a}{d}}\,l.$$

Due to $0 \le C < 2\sqrt{ad}$, we have $1 - \lambda^2/4 > 0$ and hence for all large l, by a well-known result on logistic type equations (see, e.g., Theorem 5.1 in [8]), problem (2.2) has a unique positive solution v_l, which in turn defines a unique positive solution w_l for (2.1).

Now we choose an increasing sequence $l_1 < l_2 < \cdots < l_n \to \infty$ with l_1 large enough so that $w_n := w_{l_n}$ is defined for all $n \ge 1$. By the comparison principle (Lemma 2.1 in [15]), we have $w_n \le w_{n+1}$ on $(-l_n, l_n)$. As any positive constant M satisfying $M \ge a/b$ can be used as a supersolution of (2.1), we see that $w_n \le a/b$ for all n. Thus, $w_\infty = \lim_{n\to\infty} w_n$ is well-defined on $\mathbb{R}^1$. Furthermore, by the standard regularity considerations, we see that $w_n \to w_\infty$ in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^1)$ and w_∞ satisfies

$$-dw''_\infty - Cw'_\infty = aw_\infty - bw^2_\infty, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^1. \tag{2.3}$$

As $w_\infty \ge w_n > 0$ on $(-l_n, l_n)$ for each n, we know that w_∞ is a positive solution of (2.3).

By Lemma 2.1 in [15], we easily see $w_\infty(x) \ge w_n(x+x_0)$ on $(-l_n - x_0, l_n - x_0)$ for arbitrary x_0. Hence, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$, $w_\infty(x) \ge \max_{[-l_n,l_n]} w_n = \|w_n\|_\infty$ for all n. Let $n \to \infty$, we otain $w_\infty(x) \ge \lim_{n\to\infty} \|w_n\|_\infty = \|w_\infty\|_\infty$. Hence $w_\infty(x) = \|w_\infty\|_\infty$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$. By (2.3), w_∞ equals to a/b. So, $\lim_{l\to\infty} w_l(x) = a/b$ uniformly in any compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^1$.

Define $U_l(x) := w_l(x + l)$. From the proof of Proposition 2.1 in [7] we know that

$$U_l(x) \to U_*(x) \ \text{ in } C^1_{loc}((-\infty, 0]) \quad \text{as } \ l \to \infty, \tag{2.4}$$

and U_* is the unique positive solution of

$$-dU'' - CU' = aU - bU^2 \text{ for } x \in (-\infty, 0],\ U(0) = 0.$$

Moreover, if $c_0(\mu_C) = C$, then $U'_*(0) = -C/\mu_C$. Therefore

$$\lim_{l\to+\infty} w'_l(l) = \lim_{l\to+\infty} U'_l(0) = U'_*(0) = -C/\mu_C.$$

The proof is complete. □

Next we consider, for $l \ge 0$ and $L > -l$, the logistic type problem

$$\begin{cases} dV'' + cV' + A(x)V - bV^2 = 0, & -l < x < L, \\ V(-l) = V(L) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

Let $\lambda_1[-l, L]$ denote the first eigenvalue of

$$\begin{cases} -d\phi'' - c\phi' - A(x)\phi = \lambda\phi, & -l < x < L, \\ \phi(-l) = \phi(L) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then (2.5) has a unique positive solution, which we denote by $V_{l,L}$, if and only if $\lambda_1[-l, L] < 0$.

Since $A(x) = a$ for $x \ge 0$, and $c \in (0, c_0)$, we see from the phase-plane analysis for case (iv) in Section 3.2 of [19] (note that the c_0 there is different from our c_0 here) that there exists a unique $L(0) > 0$ such that (2.5) with $l = 0$ and $L = L(0)$ has a unique positive solution V_0 satisfying

$$-\mu V'_0(L(0)) = c.$$

We also note that the equation

$$dV'' + cV' + A(x)V - bV^2 = 0$$

can be rewritten in the form

$$-(de^{\frac{c}{d}x}V')' = e^{\frac{c}{d}x}(A(x)V - bV^2),$$

and hence the comparison principle in [15] can be applied directly to this equation.

Lemma 2.5. (*i*) *For each* $l > 0$, *there is a unique* $L(l) > -l$ *such that* (2.5) *with* $L = L(l)$ *has a unique positive solution* V_l *satisfying* $-\mu V'_l(L(l)) = c$;

(*ii*) *The function* $l \to L(l)$ *is decreasing, and* $L_* := \lim_{l\to\infty} L(l) > -l_0$;

(iii) $V_*(x) := \lim_{l\to\infty} V_l(x)$ *exists and it is the unique positive solution of*

$$\begin{cases} dV'' + cV' + A(x)V - bV^2 = 0 \text{ for } -\infty < x < L_*, \\ V(-\infty) = V(L_*) = 0, \ -\mu V'(L_*) = c. \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. For any $l > 0$, since $\lambda_1[-l, L(0)] < \lambda_1[0, L(0)] < 0$, (2.5) with $L = L(0)$ has a unique positive solution $V_{l,L(0)}$. By the comparison principle and the Hopf boundary lemma, we have

$$V_0(x) < V_{l,L(0)}(x) \text{ for } x \in [0, L(0)) \text{ and } V'_{l,L(0))}(L(0)) < V'_0(L(0)).$$

Hence

$$-\mu V'_{l,L(0)}(L(0)) > c.$$

Since $A(x-l) \leq, \not\equiv A(x)$ for $x \in [0, L(0)]$, we have

$$\lambda_1[-l, L(0) - l] > \lambda_1[0, L(0)].$$

If $\lambda_1[-l, L(0) - l] < 0$, then (2.5) with $L = L(0) - l$ has a unique positive solution $V_{l,L(0)-l}$, and we can use the comparison principle and the Hopf boundary lemma to deduce

$$V_{l,L(0)-l}(x - l) < V_0(x) \text{ for } x \in (0, L(0)), \ V'_{l,L(0)-l}(L(0) - l) > V'_0(L(0)).$$

Hence

$$-\mu V'_{l,L(0)-l}(L(0) - l) < c.$$

If $\lambda_1[-l, L(0) - l] \geq 0$, then we can find a unique $L' \in [L(0) - l, L(0))$ such that $\lambda_1[-l, L'] = 0$. Thus for $L \in (L', L(0))$ we have $\lambda_1[-l, L] < 0$ and (2.5) has a unique positive solution $V_{l,L}$. Moreover, a well-known property of the logistic type equation indicates that $\lim_{L\to L'} \|V_{l,L}\|_{C^2[-l,L]} = 0$. Hence $-\mu V'_{l,L}(L) < c$ for $L > L'$ but close to L'.

Therefore whether $\lambda_1[-l, L(0) - l] < 0$ or $\lambda_1[-l, L(0) - l] \geq 0$, we can always find some $L \in (-l, L(0))$ such that $-\mu V'_{l,L}(L) < c$. Since $-\mu V'_{l,L(0)}(L(0)) > c$, by the continuous dependence of $V'_{l,L}(L)$ on L, there exists $L(l) \in (L, L(0))$ such that

$$-\mu V'_{l,L(l)}(L(l)) = c.$$

Moreover, for $L' < L_1 < L_2 < L(0)$, we can compare $V_{l,L_1}(x)$ with $V_{l,L_2}(x + L_2 - L_1)$ over $x \in [-l, L_1]$, and use the comparison principle and Hopf Lemma, to deduce that $V'_{l,L_1}(L_1) > V'_{l,L_2}(L_2)$. This implies that $L(l)$ is uniquely determined. The proof of conclusion (i) is now complete.

We next prove the first part of (ii). For convenience, we denote $V_l = V_{l,L(l)}$. Arguing indirectly, we assume that there are $l_1 > l_2 \geq 0$ satisfying $L_1 := L(l_1) \geq L_2 := L(l_2)$. Denote $V_1(x) = V_{l_1}(x + L_1 - L_2)$, then

$$\begin{cases} -dV_1'' - cV_1' \geq A(x)V_1 - bV_1^2, \quad -l_2 < x < L_2, \\ V_1(-l_2) > 0, V_1(L_2) = 0. \end{cases}$$

By the comparison principle we have

$$V_1(x) > V_{l_2}(x) \text{ for } x \in [-l_2, L_2).$$

By the Hopf lemma, $V_1'(L_2) < V'_{l_2}(L_2) = -c/\mu$, which contradicts $V_1'(L_2) = V'_{l_1}(L_1) = -c/\mu$. The first part of conclusion (ii) is now proved.

To prove the second part of (ii) and conclusion (iii), let $\{l_n\}$ be an increasing sequence that converges to ∞. Denote $L_n := L(l_n)$ and $W_n(x) := V_{l_n}(x + L_n)$; then

$$\begin{cases} dW_n'' + cW_n' + A(x+L_n)W_n - bW_n^2 = 0, & -l_n - L_n < x < 0, \\ W_n(-l_n - L_n) = W_n(0) = 0,\ W_n'(0) = -c/\mu. \end{cases}$$

We first observe that for any $l > 0$, $L(l) > -l_0$. Otherwise $L(l) \le -l_0$ for some $l > 0$. It follows that $A(x) \equiv a_0 \le 0$ for $x \in [-l, L(l)]$. If the maximum of V_l in $[-l, L(l)]$ is attained at $x_0 \in (-l, L(l))$, then we arrive at the following contradiction:

$$0 = dV_l''(x_0) + cV_l'(x_0) + a_0 V_l(x_0) - bV_l^2(x_0) \le -bV_l^2(x_0) < 0.$$

Hence we always have $L(l) > -l_0$ and so $L_* := \lim_{n\to\infty} L_n \ge -l_0$.

Since $0 \le W_n(x) \le a/b$ for all $x \in [-l_n - L_n, 0]$, by regularity arguments of elliptic equations and a standard diagonal process, there is a subsequence of $\{W_n\}$, for convenience, still denoted by itself, such that

$$W_n \to W_* \text{ in } C^1_{loc}((-\infty, 0]),\quad a/b \ge W_*(x) \ge 0 \text{ for } x < 0$$

and

$$\begin{cases} dW_*'' + cW_*' + A(x+L_*)W_* - bW_*^2 = 0 \text{ for } x < 0, \\ W_*'(0) = -c/\mu,\quad W_*(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Since $W_*'(0) = -c/\mu < 0$, by the strong maximum principle, we necessarily have $W_*(x) > 0$ for $x \in (-\infty, 0)$. Define $V_*(x) := W_*(x - L_*)$; then $V_*(x)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} dV_*'' + cV_*' + A(x)V_* - bV_*^2 = 0,\ V_* > 0 \text{ for } x < L_*, \\ V_*'(L_*) = -c/\mu,\quad V_*(L_*) = 0. \end{cases}$$

We claim that $V_*(x) \to 0$ as $x \to -\infty$. Obviously, by regularity arguments of elliptic equations and the definition of A, $V_* \in C^2((-\infty, L_*])$ and

$$dV_*'' + cV_*' \ge bV_*^2 \text{ for } x \le -l_0. \tag{2.7}$$

Therefore

$$(e^{\frac{c}{d}x}V_*')' \ge \frac{b}{d} e^{\frac{c}{d}x} V_*^2 > 0 \text{ for } x \le -l_0.$$

Hence, $e^{\frac{c}{d}x}V_*'(x)$ is an increasing function in $(-\infty, -l_0]$. Since V_* is a bounded function, there exists $\{x_n\}$ satisfying $x_n \to -\infty$ such that

$$V_*'(x_n) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

It follows that

$$e^{\frac{c}{d}x}V_*'(x) > \lim_{n\to\infty} e^{\frac{c}{d}x_n} V_*'(x_n) = 0 \text{ for every } x \in (-\infty, -l_0].$$

Therefore, we have $V_*'(x) > 0$ in $(-\infty, -l_0]$, and $V_*(x)$ is increasing in $(-\infty, -l_0]$. This fact and $V_*(L_*) = 0$ clearly imply $L_* > -l_0$.

Denote $\tilde{m} := \lim_{x\to-\infty} V_*(x)$; then clearly $\tilde{m} \ge 0$. If $\tilde{m} > 0$, then

$$\lim_{x\to-\infty} [dV_*''(x) + cV_*'(x)] = \alpha := -a_0\tilde{m} + b\tilde{m}^2 > 0,$$

from which we immediately obtain $V_*(x) \to -\infty$ as $x \to -\infty$. This contradiction shows that $\tilde{m} = 0$.

Finally we note that due to conclusion (ii), $L_* = \lim_{l\to+\infty} L(l)$ is uniquely determined. The uniqueness of V_* follows from the uniqueness of initial value problems of second order ODEs, since V_* can be viewed as the unique solution of the initial value problem

$$dV'' + cV' = bV^2 - A(x)V,\ V(L_*) = 0,\ V'(L_*) = -c/\mu.$$

The proof is complete. □

Remark 2.6. Let us observe that for any $l \le 0$, due to $A(\xi) = a$ for $\xi \ge 0$, $V_l(x) := V_0(x+l)$ is the unique positive solution of (2.5) with $L = L(l) := L(0) - l$ that satisfies $-\mu V_l'(L) = c$. From the proof of Lemma 2.5, it is easily seen that $L(l) \to L(0)$ as $l \to 0^+$. Therefore $L(l)$ is a continuous and strictly decreasing function of l for $l \in \mathbb{R}^1$, with $L(+\infty) = L_*,\ L(-\infty) = +\infty$.

Remark 2.7. Consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} dW'' + cW' + A(x)W - bW^2 = 0, & -l < x < L_*, \\ W(-l) = M, \quad W(L_*) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

where $M = \max\{\|u_0\|_\infty, a/b\}$. By a simple super-subsolution argument, and the comparison principle ([15]), (2.8) has a unique positive solution $W_l(x)$, $M \ge W_l(x) > V_*(x)$ in $[-l, L_*)$, and W_l is decreasing in l. By the regularity theory of elliptic equations, there exists $\alpha \in (0,1)$ such that, as $l \to +\infty$,

$$W_l \to\ W_* \text{ in } C^{1+\alpha}_{loc}((-\infty, L_*]),$$

and W_* satisfies

$$dW_*'' + cW_*' + A(x)W_* - bW_*^2 = 0 \text{ in } (-\infty, L_*];\ W_*(L_*) = 0.$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 2.5, we can show $W_*(x) \to 0$ as $x \to -\infty$. We may then argue as in the proof of the comparison principle in [15] to deduce $W_* \equiv V_*$. (So the uniqueness of V_* can also be deduced from $V_*(-\infty) = 0$, instead of using $V_*'(L_*) = -c/\mu$.)

The following result will be useful later in the paper.

Lemma 2.8. *For any given $L < L_*$ and $-l < L$, let $W_{l,L}$ denote the unique positive solution of* (2.8) *with L_* replaced by L. Then for all sufficiently large l,*

$$-\mu W_{l,L}'(L) < c.$$

Proof. If the conclusion is not ture, then there is $\{l_n\}$ converging to ∞, such that

$$-\mu W_{l_n,L}'(L) \ge c.$$

By regularity arguments of elliptic equations, there exist $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and a subsequence of $\{l_n\}$, for convenience still denoted it by itself, such that as $n \to \infty$,

$$W_{l_n,L} \to\ W_L \text{ in } C^{1+\alpha}_{loc}((-\infty, L]).$$

Then, it is easily seen that

$$\begin{cases} dW_L'' + cW_L' + A(x)W_L - bW_L^2 = 0, & -\infty < x < L, \\ W_L(-\infty) = W_L(L) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

and $-\mu W_L'(L) \ge c$.

Let $\tilde{V}_*(x) = V_*(x - L + L_*)$; then from $A(x - L + L_*) \geq A(x)$ we obtain

$$d\tilde{V}_*'' + c\tilde{V}_*' + A(x)\tilde{V}_* - b\tilde{V}_*^2 \leq 0 \text{ in } (-\infty, L).$$

Since $\tilde{V}_*(-\infty) = W_L(-\infty) = 0$, as in the proof of the comparison principle in [15], we can show $\tilde{V}_* \geq W_L$ in $(-\infty, L]$, and hence

$$-\mu W_L'(L) \leq -\mu \tilde{V}_*'(L) = -\mu V_*'(L_*) = c.$$

So, $-\mu W_L'(L) = c$ holds. As before, we can show that $W_L'(x) > 0$ in $(-\infty, -l_0]$, which together with $W_L(L) = 0$ implies $L > -l_0$. Then $\tilde{V}_*$ is a strict supersolution of (2.9). By the comparison principle, strong maximum principle and Hopf Lemma, we obtain $\tilde{V}_* > W_L$ in $(-\infty, L)$ and $W_L'(L) > \tilde{V}_*'(L) = V_*'(L_*)$. Hence

$$-\frac{c}{\mu} = W_L'(L) > V_*'(L_*) = -\frac{c}{\mu}.$$

This contradiction finishes the proof. □

3. THE TRICHOTOMY

In this section, we will prove the following trichotomy result, which clearly implies Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that* $c \in (0, c_0)$ *and* (u, h) *is the unique solution of* (1.3)*. Then*

(i) *vanishing happens if* $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] < L_*$;
(ii) *borderline spreading happens if* $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = L_*$;
(iii) *spreading happens if* $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] > L_*$.

The proof of this theorem will take up the rest of this section, which is divided into four subsections. Unless otherwise specified, throughout this section, we always assume that

$$0 < c < c_0.$$

3.1. Properties of $h(t)$.

In this subsection, we prove some important properties of $h(t)$, which form the conner stones in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Our arguments here are based on various comparison techniques, and following [14] and [19], in several key steps we will make use of some zero number results derived from Angenent [1].

Lemma 3.2. *If* $\limsup\limits_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = \infty$*, then* $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = \infty$.

Proof. For arbitrarily given $\tilde{l} > h_0$, define

$$I(t) = [z_1(t), z_2(t)] := [ct + \tilde{l}, ct + L(0) + \tilde{l}]$$

and

$$w(t, x) := V_0(x - ct - \tilde{l}), \quad t > 0, \quad x \in I(t),$$

where V_0 is the unique positive solution of (2.5) with $l = 0$ and $L = L(0)$. Obviously,

$$\text{(3.1)} \qquad \begin{cases} w_t = dw_{xx} + aw - bw^2, & t > 0, \quad ct + \tilde{l} < x < ct + \tilde{l} + L(0), \\ w(t, z_1(t)) = w(t, z_2(t)) = 0, & t > 0, \\ w(0, x) = V_0(x - \tilde{l}), & \tilde{l} \leq x \leq \tilde{l} + L(0), \\ -\mu w_x(t, z_2(t)) = c, & t > 0. \end{cases}$$

Since $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t)-ct]=\infty$, and $h(0)=h_0<\tilde{l}=z_1(0)<z_2(0)$, and $h(t)$ is continuous, we can find $t>0$ such that $h(t)=z_2(t)$. Denote the smallest such t by t_1. There must exist $t_2\in(0,t_1)$ such that

$$h(t_2)=z_1(t_2) \text{ and } z_1(t)<h(t)<z_2(t) \text{ when } t\in(t_2,t_1).$$

Obviously,

$$h'(t_1)\geq z_2'(t_1)=c.$$

Denote $\eta(t,x):=u(t,x)-w(t,x)$, $J(t):=[z_1(t),h(t)]$ and let $\mathcal{Z}_{J(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot))$ be the number of zeroes of $\eta(t,\cdot)$ in $J(t)$. Since $\eta(t,z_1(t))=u(t,z_1(t))>0$ and $\eta(t,h(t))=-w(t,h(t))<0$ for $t\in(t_2,t_1)$, $\mathcal{Z}_{J(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot))\geq 1$, and the zero number result of Angenent [1] (see Lemma 2.2 in [14] for a convenient version) can be applied.

For all $t>t_2$ that is close to t_2, by the Hopf lemma and continuity, $u_x(t,x)<0$ and $w_x(t,x)>0$ for $x\in J(t)$. This implies $\eta_x(t,x)<0$ for such t and $x\in J(t)$. Therefore, for such t, $\eta(t,\cdot)$ has only one zero in $J(t)$, and it is a nondegenerate zero. Since by the zero number result $\mathcal{Z}_{J(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot))$ is nonincreasing in t for $t\in(t_2,t_1)$, the only possible case is that $\eta(t,\cdot)$ has exactly one zero for every $t\in(t_2,t_1)$; the zero number result further implies that this zero is nondegenerate. So, the zero of $\eta(t,\cdot)$ in (t_2,t_1) can be expressed as a smooth curve $x=z(t)$.

We claim that $z(t)$ converges to $h(t_1)$ when t increases to t_1. Clearly,

$$z_1(t_1)\leq x_*:=\liminf_{t\to t_1^-}z(t) \text{ and } x^*:=\limsup_{t\to t_1^-}z(t)\leq h(t_1).$$

If $x_*<x^*$, then it is easily seen that $\eta(t_1,x)\equiv 0$ for $x\in[x_*,x^*]$. We may apply Theorem 2 of [17] to η over the region $[t_1-\epsilon,t_1]\times[z_1(t_1+\epsilon),h(t_1-\epsilon)]$, with $\epsilon>0$ sufficiently small, to conclude that $\eta(t_1,x)\equiv 0$ for $x\in[z_1(t_1+\epsilon),h(t_1-\epsilon)]$. Letting $\epsilon\to 0$, we have $\eta(t_1,x)\equiv 0$ for $x\in[z_1(t_1),h(t_1)]$, which contradicts $\eta(t_1,z_1(t_1))>0$. Therefore $z(t_1):=\lim_{t\to t_1^-}z(t)$ exists.

By way of contradiction, we assume $z(t_1)<h(t_1)=ct_1+L(0)+\tilde{l}$. Consider $\eta(t,x)$ in the domain

$$\{(t,x):z(t)<x<h(t),\ t_2<t\leq t_1\}.$$

By the maximum principle and Hopf lemma, we have

$$\eta(t_1,x)<0 \text{ for } x\in(z(t_1),h(t_1)),\quad \eta(t_1,h(t_1))=0 \text{ and } \eta_x(t_1,h(t_1))>0.$$

The last inequality implies that

$$-\mu u_x(t_1,h(t_1))<-\mu w_x(t_1,ct_1+L(0)+\tilde{l})=-\mu V_0'(L(0)),$$

that is

$$h'(t_1)<c,$$

which is in contradiction with our earlier inequality $h'(t_1)\geq c$. This proves $z(t_1)=h(t_1)$.

We may now use the maximum principle to $\eta(t,x)$ over $\{(t,x):t_2<t\leq t_1, z_1(t)<x<z(t)\}$ to deduce

$$u(t_1,x)>w(t_1,x) \text{ for } x\in[ct_1+\tilde{l},ct_1+\tilde{l}+L(0)).$$

Hence we can easily see, by the comparison principle for free boundary problems (see [12]), that

$$u(t+t_1,x)\geq w(t+t_1,x) \text{ for } t>0 \text{ and } x\in(z_1(t+t_1),z_2(t+t_1)),$$

and

$$h(t+t_1) \geq z_2(t+t_1) \text{ for all } t>0.$$

So for any $t>t_1$,

$$h(t)-ct \geq \tilde{l}+L(0).$$

Since $\tilde{l}$ can be arbitrarily large, this implies $\lim_{t\to\infty}[h(t)-ct]=\infty$. □

Lemma 3.3. *If* $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t)-ct]=\infty$, *then* $\lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{h(t)}{t}=c_0$.

Proof. Since $A(x-ct)\leq a$, by the comparison principle and estimate of spreading speed in [12], we have

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty}\frac{h(t)}{t}\leq c_0.$$

Therefore, for our aim here, it suffices to show that

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty}\frac{h(t)}{t}\geq \tilde{c} \quad \forall \tilde{c}\in(c,c_0). \tag{3.2}$$

We now set to prove (3.2). For any given $\tilde{c}\in(c,c_0)$, as in Section 2 above, by the phase-plane analysis in [19], there exists a unique pair $(\tilde{L},\tilde{V}(x))$ with $\tilde{V}(x)>0$ in $(0,\tilde{L})$ such that (2.5) is satisfied with $l=0$ and $(c,L,V)=(\tilde{c},\tilde{L},\tilde{V})$. By the strong maximum principle, there exists $\epsilon>0$ such that

$$\tilde{V}(x)\leq \frac{a}{b}-\epsilon \text{ for } 0\leq x\leq \tilde{L}. \tag{3.3}$$

By Lemma 2.4, for all sufficiently large l,

$$\begin{cases} dw''+cw'+aw-bw^2=0, & -l<x<l,\\ w(-l)=w(l)=0 \end{cases}$$

has a unique positive solution w_l, and $w_l\to a/b$ uniformly in any compact subset of $(-\infty,\infty)$. So, there exists $\tilde{l}>\tilde{L}$ such that

$$w_{\tilde{l}}(x)>\frac{a}{b}-\epsilon/2 \text{ for } -\frac{\tilde{L}}{2}\leq x\leq \frac{\tilde{L}}{2}.$$

Denote $\psi_*(x)=w_{\tilde{l}}(x-\tilde{l})$; then

$$\begin{cases} d\psi_*''+c\psi_*'+a\psi_*-b\psi_*^2=0, & 0<x<2\tilde{l},\\ \psi_*(0)=\psi_*(2\tilde{l})=0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\psi_*(x)>\frac{a}{b}-\epsilon/2 \text{ for } \tilde{l}-\frac{\tilde{L}}{2}\leq x\leq \tilde{l}+\frac{\tilde{L}}{2}. \tag{3.4}$$

For any $\psi_0\in C^1([0,2\tilde{l}])$ satisfying $\psi_0(x)>0$ for $x\in(0,2\tilde{l})$, and $\psi_0(0)=\psi_0(2\tilde{l})=0$, the auxiliary initial boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \psi_t=d\psi_{xx}+c\psi_x+a\psi-b\psi^2, & t>0,\quad 0<x<2\tilde{l},\\ \psi(t,0)=\psi(t,2\tilde{l})=0, & t>0,\\ \psi(0,x)=\psi_0(x), & 0\leq x\leq 2\tilde{l} \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

has a unique positive solution $\psi(t,x;\psi_0)$, and it is well known that

$$\psi(t,x;\psi_0)\to\psi_*(x) \text{ uniformly as } t\to\infty.$$

By (3.4), there exists $T = T(\psi_0)$ such that when $t \geq T$,

$$\psi(t, x; \psi_0) > \frac{a}{b} - \epsilon \ \text{ for } \tilde{l} - \frac{\tilde{L}}{2} \leq x \leq \tilde{l} + \frac{\tilde{L}}{2}. \tag{3.6}$$

Now, denote $v(t, x) := u(t, x + ct)$ and $g(t) := h(t) - ct$. Due to $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = \infty$ and Lemma 3.2, there exists $T_1 > 0$ such that $g(t) > 2\tilde{l}$ for all $t \geq T_1$. We also have

$$\begin{cases} v_t = dv_{xx} + cv_x + av - bv^2, & t > T_1, \quad 0 < x < g(t), \\ v(t, 0) > 0, \quad v(t, g(t)) = 0, & t > T_1, \\ v(T_1, x) = u(T_1, x + cT_1), & 0 \leq x \leq g(T_1). \end{cases}$$

Therefore if we have chosen ψ_0 in (3.5) satisfying $0 < \psi_0(x) \leq u(T_1, x + cT_1)$ for $0 < x < 2\tilde{l}$, then by the comparison principle,

$$\psi(t, x; \psi_0) < v(t + T_1, x) \ \text{ for } t > 0 \text{ and } 0 < x < 2\tilde{l}.$$

By virtue of (3.6), we have

$$v(T_1 + T, x) > \frac{a}{b} - \epsilon \ \text{ when } \tilde{l} - \frac{\tilde{L}}{2} < x < \tilde{l} + \frac{\tilde{L}}{2}. \tag{3.7}$$

Denote $T_0 = T + T_1$, and we obtain, from (3.7),

$$u(T_0, x) > \frac{a}{b} - \epsilon \ \text{ for } \tilde{l} + cT_0 - \frac{\tilde{L}}{2} < x < \tilde{l} + cT_0 + \frac{\tilde{L}}{2}.$$

Now we set

$$\underline{u}(t, x) := \tilde{V}(x - \tilde{c}t - \tilde{l} - cT_0 + \frac{\tilde{L}}{2}),$$

$$\xi_1(t) := \tilde{c}t + \tilde{l} + cT_0 - \frac{\tilde{L}}{2}, \quad \xi_2(t) := \tilde{c}t + \tilde{l} + cT_0 + \frac{\tilde{L}}{2}.$$

Clearly

$$\begin{gathered} \underline{u}_t = d\underline{u}_{xx} + a\underline{u} - b\underline{u}^2 \ \text{ for } t > 0, \ \xi_1(t) < x < \xi_2(t), \\ \underline{u}(t, \xi_1(t)) = \underline{u}(t, \xi_2(t)) = 0, \\ -\mu\underline{u}_x(t, \xi_2(t)) = \tilde{c} = \xi_2'(t), \\ \xi_1(0) > cT_0, \quad \xi_2(0) < h(T_0), \end{gathered}$$

and

$$\underline{u}(0, x) = \tilde{V}(x - \tilde{l} - cT_0 + \frac{\tilde{L}}{2}) \leq \frac{a}{b} - \epsilon < u(T_0, x) \ \text{ when } \xi_1(0) \leq x \leq \xi_2(0).$$

By the comparison principle,

$$u(t + T_0, x) \geq \underline{u}(t, x) \text{ for } t \geq 0, \quad x \in [\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t)], \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$h(t + T_0) \geq \xi_2(t) = \tilde{c}t + \tilde{l} + cT_0 + \frac{\tilde{L}}{2} \text{ for all } t > 0,$$

which implies (3.2). □

Lemma 3.4. *If* $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = H^*$ *and* $L_* < H^* < \infty$, *then* $\lim_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = H^*$.

Proof. It suffices to show that for any $\tau \in (0, H^* - L_*)$, $h(t) - ct \geq H^* - \tau$ for all large t. We now fix an arbitrary $\tau \in (0, H^* - L_*)$. Since $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = H^*$, there exists $T_0 > 0$ such that

$$h(T_0) - cT_0 > H^* - \tau.$$

Due to $H^* - \tau > L_*$, by Remark 2.6 and Lemma 2.5, there exists a unique pair (l_*, V_{l_*}) such that $L(l_*) = H^* - \tau$ and

$$\begin{cases} dV_{l_*}'' + cV_{l_*}' + A(x)V_{l_*} - bV_{l_*}^2 = 0, \ V_{l_*} > 0 \text{ for } x \in (-l_*, H^* - \tau), \\ V_{l_*}(-l_*) = V_{l_*}(H^* - \tau) = 0, \ -\mu V_{l_*}'(H^* - \tau) = c. \end{cases}$$

Claim 1: There exists $T \geq T_0$ such that $h(t) - ct > -l_*$ when $t \geq T$.

Otherwise, due to $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = H^*$, there exist $t_2 > t_1 > T$ such that

$$h(t_1) - ct_1 = -l_*, \ h(t_2) - ct_2 = H^* - \tau$$

and

$$-l_* < h(t) - ct < H^* - \tau \ \text{ for } t \in (t_1, t_2).$$

Set $v(t, x) := u(t, x + ct)$. Then,

$$v_t = dv_{xx} + cv_x + A(x)v - bv^2 \text{ for } t > 0, -ct < x < h(t) - ct.$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.2, by using the zero number argument and suitable comparison principles, we can prove

$$v(t_2, x) > V_{l_*}(x) \ \text{ for } -l_* \leq x < H^* - \tau,$$

that is

$$u(t_2, x + ct_2) > V_{l_*}(x) \ \text{ for } -l_* \leq x < H^* - \tau.$$

To stress the dependence of l_* on c, we now write $l_* = l_{*,c}$, with $L(l_{*,c})$, $V_{l_{*,c}}$ understood accordingly. By the Hopf lemma and continuity, there exist small $\delta > 0$ such that

$$u(t_2, x + ct_2) > V_{l_{*,c+\delta}}(x) \ \text{ for } x \in [-l_{*,c+\delta}, H^* - \tau).$$

We now define

$$\underline{u}(t, x) := V_{l_{*,c+\delta}}(x - ct_2 - (c + \delta)t),$$
$$\xi_1(t) = (c + \delta)t + ct_2 - l_{*,c+\delta},$$
$$\xi_2(t) = (c + \delta)t + ct_2 + H^* - \tau.$$

Then for $t > 0$ and $x \in (\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t))$,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{u}_t &= d\underline{u}_{xx} + A(x - ct_2 - (c + \delta)t)\underline{u} - b\underline{u}^2 \\ &\leq d\underline{u}_{xx} + A(x - c(t + t_2))\underline{u} - b\underline{u}^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$\underline{u}(t, \xi_1(t)) = \underline{u}(t, \xi_2(t)) = 0,$$
$$-\mu\underline{u}_x(t, \xi_2(t)) = c + \delta = \xi_2'(t)$$

and

$$\underline{u}(0, x) \leq u(t_2, x) \text{ for } x \in [\xi_1(0), \xi_2(0)].$$

Applying the comparison principle to $(u(x, t_2 + t), h(t_2 + t))$ and $(\underline{u}(x, t), \xi_2(t))$ over $\{(x, t) : x \in [\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t)], t > 0\}$, we obtain, for $t > 0$,

$$u(t_2 + t, x) \geq \underline{u}(t, x) \text{ for } x \in [\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t)]$$

and

$$h(t+t_2) \geq \xi_2(t).$$

But this last inequality is in contradiction with $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t)-ct] = H^* < \infty$. We have thus proved Claim 1.

Claim 2: There exists $T_* > T$ such that

$$h(t) - ct \geq H^* - \tau \text{ for all } \ t > T_*.$$

Since $\tau > 0$ can be arbitrarily small, this claim clearly implies the validity of the lemma.

Suppose the claimed conclusion is not true. Then, in view of $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t)-ct] = H^*$, the function $[h(t)-ct]-(H^*-\tau)$ changes sign infinitely many times as t increases to ∞. We are going to use this fact to derive a contradiction.

Define

$$\eta(t,x) := u(t,x+ct) - V_{l_*}(x),$$
$$l(t) := \min\{h(t)-ct, H^*-\tau\} \text{ and } I(t) := [-l_*, l(t)],$$

and let $\mathcal{Z}_{I(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot))$ denote the number of zeros of $\eta(t,\cdot)$ over $I(t)$.

Clearly

$$\eta_t - d\eta_{xx} - c\eta_x = \Big(A(x) - b\big[u(t,x+ct) + V_{l_*}(x)\big]\Big)\eta,$$

and for all large t such that $-l_* + ct > 0$, we have

$$\eta(t,-l_*) = u(t,-l_*+ct) > 0.$$

Moreover, $\eta(t,l(t)) = 0$ if and only if $[h(t)-ct]-(H^*-\tau) = 0$.

Following an approach used in [14], we now examine the value of $\mathcal{Z}_{I(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot))$ near any t where $h(t)-ct$ crosses or touches the value $H^*-\tau$. Choose $s_1 > s_0 \geq T$ such that $-l_* + cs_0 > 0$ and

$$-l_* < h(s) - cs < H^* - \tau \text{ for } s \in [s_0, s_1), \ h(s_1) - cs_1 = H^* - \tau. \tag{3.9}$$

Then

$$\eta(t,-l_*) = u(t,-l_*+ct) > 0, \ \eta(t,l(t)) = -V_{l_*}(h(t)-ct) < 0 \text{ for } t \in [s_0,s_1).$$

Hence we can use the zero number result (Lemma 2.2 in [14]) to conclude that $\mathcal{Z}_{I(s)}(\eta(s,\cdot))$ is finite and nonincreasing for $s \in (s_0,s_1)$, and each time a degenerate zero appears in $I(s)$ for $\eta(s,\cdot)$, the value of $\mathcal{Z}_{I(s)}(\eta(s,\cdot))$ is decreased by at least 1. So, in the interval (s_0,s_1), there can exist at most finitely many value of s such that $\eta(s,\cdot)$ has a degenerate zero in $I(s)$. Thus, we can choose $\tilde{s}_1 \in (s_0,s_1)$ such that for each $s \in [\tilde{s}_1,s_1)$, $\eta(s,\cdot)$ has only nondegenerate zeros in $I(s)$. Due to the nondegeneracy, the zeros of $\eta(s,\cdot)$, with $s \in [\tilde{s}_1,s_1)$, can be expressed as smooth curves:

$$x = \gamma_1(s), \cdots, x = \gamma_m(s), \text{ with } -l_* < \gamma_i(s) < \gamma_{i+1}(s) < l(s) \text{ for } i = 1,2,\cdots,m-1.$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.2, we can show that the following limits exist:

$$x_1 = \lim_{s\to s_1^-}\gamma_1(s), \cdots, x_m = \lim_{s\to s_1^-}\gamma_m(s).$$

If $x_i < x_{i+1}$, then $\eta(s_1,x) \neq 0$ for $x \in (x_i,x_{i+1})$, which follows from the strong maximum principle applied to the region $D_i := \{(t,x) : \gamma_i(t) < x < \gamma_{i+1}(t), \tilde{s}_1 \leq t \leq s_1\}$. Moreover, as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we can also prove

$$x_m = H^* - \tau = h(s_1) - cs_1.$$

Now, denote the zeroes of $\eta(s_1,\cdot)$ in $I(s_1)$ by $y_1 < y_2 < \cdots < y_{m_1}$, where $m_1 \le m$, $y_1 > -l_*$ and $y_{m_1} = H^* - \tau$.

Case 1: If $\eta(s_1,x) > 0$ for $x \in (y_{m_1-1}, y_{m_1})$, we show that there exists $\tilde{s}_2 > s_1$ such that $h(t) - ct > H^* - \tau$ for $t \in (s_1, \tilde{s}_2]$.

Indeed, in this case, for fixed $\hat{x} \in (y_{m_1-1}, y_{m_1})$, from $\eta(s_1,\hat{x}) > 0$, by continuity, we can find $\tilde{s}_2 > s_1$ close to s_1 such that

$$\eta(s,\hat{x}) > 0 \text{ for } s \in [s_1, \tilde{s}_2].$$

We may then compare $(u(t,x), h(t))$ with $(V_{l_*}(x-ct), ct+H^*-\tau)$ by the comparison principle for free boundary problems ([12]) over the region

$$\Omega := \{(x,t) : ct + \hat{x} < x < ct + H^* - \tau,\ s_1 < t \le \tilde{s}_2\},$$

to conclude that

$$h(t) > ct + H^* - \tau,\ u(t,x) > V_{l_*}(x-ct) \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Hence $h(t) - ct > H^* - \tau$ for $t \in (s_1, \tilde{s}_2]$.

Case 2: If $\eta(s_1,x) < 0$ for $x \in (y_{m_1-1}, y_{m_1})$, we can similarly show that there exists $\tilde{s}_3 > s_1$ such that $h(t) - ct < H^* - \tau$ for $t \in (s_1, \tilde{s}_3]$.

Thus if we denote $\hat{s}_2 = \tilde{s}_2$ when case 1 happens, and $\hat{s}_2 = \tilde{s}_3$ when case 2 happens, we always have

$$\eta(t,x) \neq 0 \text{ for } x \in \partial I(t) = \{-l_*, l(t)\},\ t \in (s_1, \hat{s}_2].$$

Moreover, we can find $\epsilon_1 > 0$, $\epsilon_2 > 0$, both sufficiently small, such that

$$\eta(t, l(t) - \epsilon_2) \neq 0 \text{ for } t \in [s_1 - \epsilon_1, \hat{s}_2],$$

and

$$\eta(t,x) \neq 0 \text{ for } t \in (s_1, \hat{s}_2],\ x \in [l(t) - \epsilon_2, l(t)]. \tag{3.10}$$

Thus we can apply Lemma 2.2 of [14] to conclude that

$$\mathcal{Z}_{[-l_*, l(t)-\epsilon_2]}(\eta(t,\cdot)) \text{ is finite and nondecreasing for } t \in (s_1 - \epsilon_1, \hat{s}_2],$$

and its value is decreased by at least 1 whenever $\eta(t,\cdot)$ has a degenerate zero in $[-l_*, l(t) - \epsilon_2]$. This implies, in particular, that there can exist at most finitely many $t \in (s_1, \hat{s}_2]$ such that $\eta(t,\cdot)$ has a degenerate zero in $[-l_*, l(t) - \epsilon_2]$. Hence we can find $\bar{s}_2 \in (s_1, \hat{s}_2]$ such that $\eta(t,\cdot)$ has only nondegenerate zeros in $[-l_*, l(t) - \epsilon_2]$ for $t \in (s_1, \bar{s}_2]$. As before, for $t \in (s_1, \bar{s}_2]$, we can respresent the nondegenerate zeros of $\eta(t,\cdot)$ in $[-l_*, l(t) - \epsilon_2]$ by

$$\tilde{\gamma}_1(t) < \tilde{\gamma}_2(t) < \ldots < \tilde{\gamma}_p(t),$$

and each $\tilde{\gamma}_i(t)$ is a smooth function for $t \in (s_1, \bar{s}_2]$. Moreover, $\tilde{z}_i := \lim_{t \to s_1^+} \tilde{\gamma}_i(t)$ exists for each $i \in \{1, ..., p\}$, for otherwise $w(s_1,\cdot)$ would be identically zero over some interval of x, contradicting to what we know about $w(s_1,\cdot)$. Furthermore, $\tilde{z}_i < \tilde{z}_{i+1}$ for $i \in \{1, ..., p-1\}$, since otherwise we may apply the maximum principle over the region $\tilde{A}_i := \{(x,t) : \tilde{\gamma}_i(t) < x < \tilde{\gamma}_{i+1}(t), s_1 \le t \le \bar{s}_2\}$ to deduce $w \equiv 0$ in $\tilde{A}_i$. Therefore $\tilde{z}_1 < \ldots < \tilde{z}_p$ are different zeros of $\eta(s_1,\cdot)$ in $[-l_*, l(s_1) - \epsilon_2]$. It follows immediately that $\{\tilde{z}_i : 1 \le i \le p\} \subset \{y_j : 1 \le j \le m_1 - 1\}$ and hence $p \le m_1 - 1$. In view of (3.10), we have

$$\mathcal{Z}_{I(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot)) = \mathcal{Z}_{[-l_*, l(t)-\epsilon_2]}(\eta(t,\cdot)) = p \le m_1 - 1 \text{ for } t \in (s_1, \bar{s}_2].$$

Recalling that

$$\mathcal{Z}_{I(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot)) = m \text{ for } t \in (\tilde{s}_1, s_1),$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}_{I(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot)) = m_1 \leq m \text{ for } t = s_1,$$

we see that the value of $\mathcal{Z}_{I(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot))$ is decreased by at least 1 when t increases across s_1, and s_1 is an isolated zero of the function $[h(t) - ct] - (H^* - \tau)$.

We now observe that if (3.9) is changed to

$$h(s) - cs > H^* - \tau \text{ for } s \in [s_0, s_1),\ h(s_1) - cs_1 = H^* - \tau,$$

then the above arguments carry over and we also obtain the conclusion that $\mathcal{Z}_{I(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot))$ is decreased by at least 1 when t increases across s_1, and s_1 is an isolated zero of the function $[h(t)-ct]-(H^*-\tau)$. The only point that requires extra attention is the following: We need to show $\mathcal{Z}_{I(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot)) \geq 1$ for $t \in (s_0, s_1]$. Otherwise we can use the comparison principle for free boundary problems to show that $h(t) > ct + H^* - \tau$ for $t > s_1$ and $u(t,x) > V_{l_*}(x - ct)$ for $x \in [ct - l_*, ct + H^* - \tau]$ and $t > s_1$, which is in contradiction to the fact that the function $[h(t) - ct] - (H^* - \tau)$ changes sign infinitely many times as $t \to +\infty$.

By repeating the above process we can find a sequence $s_0 < s_1 < s_2 < ... < s_n < s_{n+1} < ...$ such that

(i) $h(t) - ct = H^* - \tau$ for $t \in \{s_n : n \geq 1\}$, $h(t) - ct \neq H^* - \tau$ for $t \in \cup_{n\geq 1}(s_n, s_{n+1})$,

(ii) $\mathcal{Z}_{I(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot))$ is finite and nonincreasing for $t \in [s_0, \lim_{n\to\infty} s_n)$, and

(iii) $0 \leq \mathcal{Z}_{I(t)}(\eta(t,\cdot)) \leq \mathcal{Z}_{I(s_1)}(\eta(s_1,\cdot)) - n$ for $t \in (s_n, s_{n+1})$.

Here to guarantee that infinitely many such s_n exist, we have used the fact that the function $[h(t) - ct] - (H^* - \tau)$ changes sign infinitely many times as $t \to \infty$,

Letting $n \to \infty$ in (iii), we deduce $\mathcal{Z}_{I(s_1)}(\eta(s_1,\cdot)) = +\infty$, a contradiction. This completes the proof. ☐

The following result indicates that the situation described in Lamma 3.4 actually can never happen.

Lemma 3.5. *If* $H^* := \limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] < \infty$, *then* $H^* \leq L_*$.

Proof. Suppose that the conclusion is not true, i.e., $H^* \in (L_*, \infty)$. Then we can apply Lemma 3.4 to conclude that $\lim_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = H^*$. Choose a sequence $\{t_n\}$ satisfying $t_n \to \infty$. We define

$$g(t) := h(t) - ct,\ w(t,x) := u(t, x + h(t)),\quad t > 0,\ x < 0,$$

$$w_n(t,x) := w(t + t_n, x),\ g_n(t) := g(t + t_n),\quad h_n(t) := h(t + t_n).$$

Then

$$\tag{3.11} \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial w_n}{\partial t} = d\dfrac{\partial^2 w_n}{\partial x^2} + [c + g_n'(t)]\frac{\partial w_n}{\partial x} & \\ \qquad\qquad +A(x + g_n(t))w_n - bw_n^2, & t > -t_n, -h_n(t) < x < 0,\\ w_n(t,0) = 0, & t > -t_n,\\ -\mu\dfrac{\partial w_n}{\partial x}(t,0) = c + g_n'(t), & t > -t_n. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 2.2, $\{w_n\}$ and $\{g_n'\}$ are bounded in the L^∞ norm. By the L^p estimates and Sobolev embeddings, and a standard diagonal process, there exists a subsequence of $\{w_n\}$, denoted still by $\{w_n\}$ for convenience, such that

$$w_n \to \hat{w} \text{ in } C_{loc}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2},1+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^1 \times (-\infty, 0]),$$

where $\alpha \in (0,1)$. By virtue of the third identity in (3.11), we have

$$g_n'(t) \to \xi(t) := -\mu \frac{\partial \hat{w}}{\partial x}(t,0) - c \text{ in } C^{\alpha/2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^1) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Since

$$g_n(t) = g_n(0) - \int_0^t g_n'(s)ds,$$

letting $n \to \infty$, we have, in view of $\lim_{n\to\infty} g_n(t) = \lim_{s\to\infty}[h(s) - cs] = H^*$,

$$H^* = H^* - \int_0^t \xi(s)ds.$$

So for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^1$, $\int_0^t \xi(s)ds = 0$, which implies $\xi \equiv 0$. Now we see that $\hat{w}$ satisfies

$$(3.12) \qquad \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial \hat{w}}{\partial t} = d\dfrac{\partial^2 \hat{w}}{\partial x^2} + c\dfrac{\partial \hat{w}}{\partial x} + A(x+H^*)\hat{w} - b\hat{w}^2, & t \in \mathbb{R}^1, -\infty < x < 0,\\ \hat{w}(t,0) = 0, & t \in \mathbb{R}^1,\\ -\mu \dfrac{\partial \hat{w}}{\partial x}(t,0) = c, & t \in \mathbb{R}^1. \end{cases}$$

Since $\hat{w} \geq 0$ and $\hat{w}_x(t,0) = -c/\mu < 0$, by the strong maximum principle we must have $\hat{w}(t,x) > 0$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and $x < 0$.

Since $H^* > L_*$, by Lemma 2.5 and Remark 2.6, there exists l_* such that $L(l_*) = H^*$. Fix $\tilde{l} > l_*$ and let $\phi \in C_0([-\tilde{l} - H^*, 0])$ be a nonnegative function satisfying $\phi \not\equiv 0$ and $\phi(x) \leq \hat{w}(0,x)$ on $[-\tilde{l} - H^*, 0]$. Let $u_\phi(t,x)$ denote the unique positive solution of

$$(3.13) \qquad \begin{cases} u_t = du_{xx} + cu_x + A(x+H^*)u - bu^2, & t > 0, -\tilde{l} - H^* < x < 0,\\ u(t, -\tilde{l} - H^*) = u(t,0) = 0, & t > 0,\\ u(0,x) = \phi(x), & x \in [-\tilde{l} - H^*, 0]. \end{cases}$$

Since $\lambda_1[-\tilde{l}, H^*] < \lambda_1[-l_*, H^*] = \lambda_1[-l_*, L(l_*)] < 0$, by standard result for logistic equations we have

$$u_\phi \to u_* \text{ in } C^{1+\alpha}[-\tilde{l} - H^*, 0] \text{ as } t \to \infty,$$

where u_* is the unique positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} u_*'' + cu_*' + A(x+H^*)u_* - bu_*^2 = 0, & -\tilde{l} - H^* < x < 0,\\ u_*(-\tilde{l} - H^*) = u_*(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, since $\tilde{l} > l_*$, by the comparison principle we find that $u_*(x) > V_{l_*}(x + H^*)$ for $x \in [-l_* - H^*, 0)$. We may then apply the Hopf boundary lemma to deduce

$$u_*'(0) < V_{l_*}'(H^*) = V_{l_*}'(L(l_*)) = -c/\mu.$$

On the other hand, we may use the comparison principle to (3.13) and (3.12) to obtain $u_\phi \leq \hat{w}$ for $t > 0$ and $x \in [-\tilde{l} - H^*, 0]$, and it follows that

$$-\frac{c}{\mu} = \frac{\partial \hat{w}}{\partial x}(t,0) \leq \frac{\partial u_\phi}{\partial x}(t,0) \text{ for } t > 0.$$

Letting $t \to \infty$, we obtain

$$u_*'(0) \geq -c/\mu,$$

which contradicts $u_*'(0) < -c/\mu$. The proof is complete. □

Lemma 3.6. *If* $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = L_*$, *then* $\lim_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = L_*$.

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$H_* := \liminf_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = L_*.$$

Otherwise, $H_* < L_*$. It follows that, for any $L \in (H_*, L_*)$, the function $h(t)-ct-L$ changes sign infinitely many times as $t \to \infty$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.4, we are going to derive a contradiction from this fact.

Fix $L_0 \in (H_*, L_*)$. By Lemma 2.8, there exists large $l > 0$ such that

$$-\mu W'_{l,L_0}(L_0) < c,$$

where $W_{l,L}(x)$ denotes the unique positive solution of (2.8) with L_* replaced by L. Clearly $W_{l,L_*} = W_l$, the unique positive solution of (2.8). By the choice of M in (2.8) and a simple comparison argument, we easily see that $W_l(x) > V_*(x)$ for $x \in [-l, L_*)$. By the Hopf boundary lemma, we obtain $W_l'(L_*) < V_*'(L_*) = -c/\mu$. Therefore

$$-\mu W'_{l,L_*}(L_*) = -\mu W_l'(L_*) > c.$$

By the continuous dependence of $W'_{l,L}(L)$ on L, we see that there exists $L \in (L_0, L_*)$ such that

$$-\mu W'_{l,L}(L) = c.$$

Let us observe that due to the choice of M, we have $u(t,x) < M$ for $t > 0$ and $x \in [0, h(t)]$. We now define

$$\eta(t,x) := u(t, x+ct) - W_{l,L}(x),$$
$$l(t) := \min\{h(t) - ct, L\} \text{ and } I(t) = [-l, l(t)].$$

Then for large t, say $t \geq T_0$, we have $x + ct > 0$ for $x \in I(t)$ and hence

$$\eta(t, -l) = u(t, -l+ct) - M < 0.$$

Moreover, $\eta(t, l(t)) = 0$ if and only if $h(t) - ct - L = 0$. Since $h(t) - ct - L$ changes sign infinitely many times as $t \to +\infty$, we may repeat the arguement in the proof of Claim 2 of Lemma 3.4 to derive a contradiction. The details are omitted. $\square$

3.2. **The case of spreading.**

We start by giving some sufficient conditions for

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = +\infty.$$

Let V_0 be the positive solution of (2.5) with $l = 0$ and $L = L(0)$, so that we have $-\mu V_0'(L(0)) = c$.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose there exists $t_0 \geq 0$ such that*

$$h(t_0) - ct_0 \geq L(0) \quad \textit{and} \quad u(t_0, x) \geq V_0(x - ct_0) \quad \textit{for } x \in [ct_0, ct_0 + L(0)]. \tag{3.14}$$

Then $\lim_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = +\infty$.

Proof. Define

$$\xi_1(t) := c(t + t_0), \;\; \xi_2(t) := c(t+t_0) + L(0) \text{ for } t > 0,$$

and

$$\underline{u}(t,x) := V_0(x - c(t_0 + t)) \text{ for } t > 0 \text{ and } x \in [\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t)].$$

Clearly $\underline{u}$ satisfies

$$u_t - du_{xx} = au - bu^2 \text{ for } t > 0, \; x \in [\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t)],$$

and

$$\underline{u}(t,\xi_1(t)) = \underline{u}(t,\xi_2(t)) = 0,$$
$$\xi_2'(t) = c = -\mu V_0'(L(0)) = -\mu \underline{u}_x(t,\xi_2(t)).$$

Hence in view of (3.14), and $u(t,\xi_1(t)) > 0$, and $A(x - c(t_0+t)) = a$ for $x \in [\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t)]$ and $t > 0$, we can use the comparison principle for free boundary problems to obtain

$$h(t+t_0) \geq \xi_2(t) \text{ for } t > 0$$

and

$$u(t+t_0,x) \geq \underline{u}(t,x) \text{ for } t > 0 \text{ and } x \in (\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t)).$$

Since $u(t,\xi_1(t)) > 0 = \underline{u}(t,\xi_1(t))$, by the strong maximum principle we further obtain

$$u(t+t_0,x) > \underline{u}(t,x) = V_0(x - c(t_0+t)) \text{ for } t > 0,\ x \in (\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t)),$$

and

$$h(t+t_0) > \xi_2(t) = c(t+t_0) + L(0) \text{ for } t > 0.$$

To stress the dependence of $L(0)$ and V_0 on c, we now rewrite them as $L(0) = L_c(0)$ and $V_0 = V_{0,c}$. Then by the Hopf lemma and continuity of $(L_c(0), V_{0,c})$ on c, for fixed $\tilde{t}_0 > t_0$, we can find $\tilde{c} > c$ but very close to c, such that

$$h(\tilde{t}_0) \geq \tilde{c}\,\tilde{t}_0 + L_{\tilde{c}}(0)$$

and

$$u(\tilde{t}_0,x) \geq V_{0,\tilde{c}}(x - \tilde{c}\,\tilde{t}_0) \quad \text{for } \ \tilde{c}\,\tilde{t}_0 < x < \tilde{c}\,\tilde{t}_0 + L_{\tilde{c}}(0).$$

We may now repeat the above comparison argument, but with (t_0, c) replaced by $(\tilde{t}_0, \tilde{c})$, to deduce that

$$h(t+\tilde{t}_0) \geq \tilde{c}\,(t+\tilde{t}_0) + L_{\tilde{c}}(0) \ \text{ for } t > 0,$$

and

$$u(t+\tilde{t}_0,x) \geq V_{0,\tilde{c}}(x - \tilde{c}(t+\tilde{t}_0))$$

for $t > 0$, $\tilde{c}(t+\tilde{t}_0) < x < \tilde{c}(t+\tilde{t}_0) + L_{\tilde{c}}(0)$. We thus obtain $\lim_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = \infty$. $\square$

Remark 3.8. Let us note that if we take $t_0 = 0$ in (3.14), then this sufficient condition is reduced to a condition on the initial values of (1.3):

$$h(0) \geq L(0) \text{ and } u(0,x) \geq V_0(x) \text{ in } [0, L(0)]. \tag{3.15}$$

Theorem 3.9. *If* $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] > L_*$, *then* $\lim_{t\to\infty} h(t)/t = c_0$ *and for any given small* $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\left[\sup_{0\leq x\leq (c-\varepsilon)t} u(t,x)\right] = 0, \tag{3.16}$$

and

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\left[\sup_{(c+\varepsilon)t\leq x\leq (1-\varepsilon)h(t)} \left|u(t,x) - \frac{a}{b}\right|\right] = 0. \tag{3.17}$$

We will prove (3.16) and (3.17) separately. In fact, for later applications, we will prove in Lemma 3.10 below a slightly stronger version of (3.16) without using the assumption $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = \infty$. Moreover, different from the rest of this section, the assumption $0 < c < c_0$ is also not required in Lemma 3.10.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose $c > 0$ and (u, h) is the unique solution of (1.3). For $M > 0$ define*

$$\epsilon(M) := \limsup_{t\to\infty} \left[\sup_{0\le x\le ct-M} u(t,x) \right].$$

Then $\lim_{M\to\infty} \epsilon(M) = 0$. Here we understand that $u(t,x) = 0$ for $x \ge h(t)$.

Proof. Let us define

$$\tilde{u}(t,x) = \begin{cases} u(t,x), & t > 0,\ x \ge 0, \\ u(t,-x), & t > 0,\ x < 0. \end{cases}$$

Then $\tilde{u}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_t - d\tilde{u}_{xx} = A(|x| - ct)\tilde{u} - b\tilde{u}^2, & t > 0,\ x \in (-h(t), h(t)), \\ \tilde{u}(t, -h(t)) = \tilde{u}(t, h(t)) = 0, & t > 0. \end{cases}$$

Suppose that $\lim_{M\to\infty} \epsilon(M) = 0$ does not hold. Then there exist $\sigma_0 > 0$ and a sequence $M_n \to \infty$ such that $\epsilon(M_n) > \sigma_0$ for all $n \ge 1$. Therefore we can find a sequence of points (t_n, x_n) satisfying $t_n \to \infty$ and $x_n \in [0, ct_n - M_n]$ such that

$$\tilde{u}(t_n, x_n) > \sigma_0.$$

Set

$$\tau_n := t_n - \frac{M_n}{3c},$$

and for $0 < t < t_n - \tau_n$ and $x \in \left(-\frac{M_n}{2}, \frac{M_n}{2}\right) \cap \left(-h(t+\tau_n) - x_n, h(t+\tau_n) - x_n\right)$, define

$$v_n(t,x) := \tilde{u}(t + \tau_n, x + x_n).$$

Obviously,

$$t_n - \tau_n = \frac{M_n}{3c} \to \infty,\ \tau_n \ge \frac{2}{3} t_n \to \infty,$$

and for $0 \le t \le t_n - \tau_n$ and $-\frac{M_n}{2} < x < \frac{M_n}{2}$, we have

$$|x + x_n| - c(t + \tau_n) \le \frac{M_n}{2} + ct_n - M_n - c\tau_n = -\frac{M_n}{6}.$$

Hence for all large n, $A(|x + x_n| - c(t + \tau_n)) = a_0$, and $v_n(t,x)$ satisfies, for $0 < t < t_n - \tau_n$ and $x \in \left(-\frac{M_n}{2}, \frac{M_n}{2}\right) \cap \left(-h(t+\tau_n) - x_n, h(t+\tau_n) - x_n\right)$,

$$\frac{\partial v_n}{\partial t} - d\frac{\partial^2 v_n}{\partial x^2} = a_0 v_n - b v_n^2,$$

and

$$v_n(t_n - \tau_n, 0) = \tilde{u}(t_n, x_n) > \sigma_0.$$

Set $M_0 := \max\{a/b, \|u_0\|_\infty\}$ and let $\tilde{v}_l$ be the unique positive solution of the following initial-boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t - dv_{xx} = -bv^2, & t > 0,\ -l < x < l, \\ v(t, -l) = v(t, l) = M_0, & t > 0, \\ v(0, x) = M_0, & -l < x < l. \end{cases} \tag{3.18}$$

Then, $\tilde{v}_l(t, \cdot)$ converges to v_l^* uniformly in $[-l, l]$ as $t \to \infty$, where v_l^* is the unique positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} dv_{xx} = bv^2, & -l < x < l, \\ v(-l) = v(l) = M_0. \end{cases}$$

Using Lemma 2.2 in [15], we have $\lim_{l\to+\infty} v_l^*(x)=0$ uniformly in any compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^1$. Fix large $l>0$ such that $v_l^*(0)<\sigma_0/2$. Then, we choose large $t_0>0$ such that for $t\geq t_0$, $\tilde{v}_l(t,0)<\sigma_0$. A simple comparison consideration yields $\tilde{u}\leq M_0$. Hence for all large n such that $\tilde{M}_n/2>l$, we can compare v_n with $\tilde{v}_l$ by the comparison principle to obtain

$$v_n(t,x)\leq \tilde{v}_l(t,x) \ \text{ for } 0<t<t_n-\tau_n,\ x\in[-l,l].$$

Since $t_n-\tau_n\to\infty$ as $n\to\infty$, we have $t_n-\tau_n>t_0$ for all large n, and hence

$$\tilde{u}(t_n,x_n)=v_n(t_n-\tau_n,0)\leq \tilde{v}_l(t_n-\tau_n,0)<\sigma_0 \text{ for all large } n,$$

which contradicts $\tilde{u}(t_n,x_n)>\sigma_0$. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 3.9. By Lemma 3.5, we necessarily have $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t)-ct]=+\infty$. Hence we can apply Lemma 3.3 to conclude that $\lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{h(t)}{t}=c_0$, and (3.16) is clearly a consequence of Lemma 3.10.

It remains to prove (3.17), and this will be accomplished by an indirect argument. Suppose that there exists $\sigma_0>0$ such that for some small $\epsilon_0>0$ and some sequence of points (t_n,x_n) satisfying $t_n\to\infty$, $x_n\in[(c+\epsilon_0)t_n,(1-\epsilon_0)h(t_n)]$, we have

$$|u(t_n,x_n)-\frac{a}{b}|>\sigma_0.$$

Choose $\delta>0$ small so that

$$1-\frac{\epsilon_0}{3}<(1-\delta)\Big(1-\frac{\epsilon_0}{4}\Big),\ c+\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}>(1-\delta)\Big(c+\frac{\epsilon_0}{4}\Big).$$

Then define

$$\gamma_n:=(1-\delta)t_n,$$

$$\Omega_n:=\big\{(t,x):0\leq t\leq t_n-\gamma_n,\ -\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}t_n<x<\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}h(t_n)\big\},$$

and

$$v_n(t,x):=u(t+\gamma_n,x+x_n)\ \text{ for } (t,x)\in\Omega_n.$$

Then we have

$$|v_n(t_n-\gamma_n,0)-\frac{a}{b}|>\sigma_0 \text{ for all } n. \tag{3.19}$$

Moreover, for $(t,x)\in\Omega_n$,

$$x+x_n-c(t+\gamma_n)\geq -\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}t_n+(c+\epsilon_0)t_n-ct_n=\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}t_n\to\infty,$$

and in view of our choice of δ and the property $\lim_{t\to\infty}h(t)/t=c_0$, we also have, for all large n,

$$x+x_n\leq\Big(1-\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}\Big)h(t_n)\leq\Big(1-\frac{\epsilon_0}{3}\Big)c_0t_n\leq\Big(1-\frac{\epsilon_0}{4}\Big)c_0\gamma_n, \tag{3.20}$$

$$x+x_n\geq\Big(c+\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}\Big)t_n>\Big(c+\frac{\epsilon_0}{4}\Big)\gamma_n. \tag{3.21}$$

Therefore, for $(t,x)\in\Omega_n$ with large n,

$$A(x+x_n-c(t+\gamma_n))=a$$

and v_n satisfies

$$\frac{\partial v_n}{\partial t}=d\frac{\partial^2 v_n}{\partial x^2}+av_n-bv_n^2.$$

We recall that the comparison principle gives $\tilde{u}(t,x) \leq \bar{w}(t)$ for $t > 0$ and $x \in [0, h(t)]$, where $\bar{w}(t)$ is the solution of the problem

$$\frac{d\bar{w}}{dt} = a\bar{w} - b\bar{w}^2,\ t > 0;\quad \bar{w}(0) = M.$$

Since $\lim_{t\to\infty} \bar{w}(t) = \frac{a}{b}$, we deduce

$$\overline{\lim}_{t\to\infty} u(t,x) \leq \frac{a}{b} \quad \text{uniformly for } \ x \in [0, h(t)]. \tag{3.22}$$

In view of (3.19), this implies

$$v_n(t_n - \gamma_n, 0) < \frac{a}{b} - \sigma_0 \text{ for all large } \ n. \tag{3.23}$$

Now, choose large l satisfying $\tilde{w}_l^*(0) > a/b - \sigma_0/2$ (see [8]), where $\tilde{w}_l^*$ is the unique positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} -dw'' = aw - bw^2, & -l < x < l, \\ w(-l) = w(l) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Fix such an l. For all large n we have $\frac{\epsilon_0}{2} t_n > l$ and

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial v_n}{\partial t} = d\frac{\partial^2 v_n}{\partial x^2} + av_n - bv_n^2, & 0 < t < t_n - \gamma_n,\ -l < x < l, \\ v_n(t,-l) > 0,\ v_n(t,l) > 0, & 0 < t < t_n - \gamma_n, \\ v_n(0,x) = u(\gamma_n, x + x_n), & -l < x < l. \end{cases} \tag{3.24}$$

We will show that, there exists $\beta > 0$ such that for all large n, say $n \geq n_0$, we have

$$u(\gamma_n, x + x_n) \geq \beta \text{ for } \ -l < x < l. \tag{3.25}$$

Assuming (3.25), we now derive a contradiction. Let $\tilde{w}_l(t,x)$ be the unique positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} w_t = dw_{xx} + aw - bw^2, & t > 0,\ -l < x < l, \\ w(t,-l) = 0,\ w(t,l) = 0, & t > 0, \\ w(0,x) = \beta, & -l < x < l. \end{cases} \tag{3.26}$$

Since $\tilde{w}_l(t,\cdot)$ converges to $\tilde{w}_l^*$ uniformly as $t \to \infty$, there exists $T_* > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{w}_l(t,0) > \frac{a}{b} - \sigma_0 \text{ when } t \geq T_*. \tag{3.27}$$

Due to (3.25), we can apply the comparison principle to (3.24) and (3.26) to conclude that

$$\tilde{w}_l(t,x) \leq v_n(t,x) \text{ for } \ 0 \leq t \leq t_n - \gamma_n,\ -l < x < l.$$

In view of $t_n - \gamma_n \to \infty$ and (3.27), we thus obtain

$$v_n(t_n - \gamma_n, 0) \geq \tilde{w}_l(t_n - \gamma_n, 0) > \frac{a}{b} - \sigma_0 \text{ for all large } n,$$

which contradicts (3.23).

To complete the proof of the theorem, we still have to show (3.25). This will be done by a careful examination of the proof of Lemma 3.3. We first observe that for all large n,

$$[-l, l] \subset \left[-\frac{\epsilon_0}{2} t_n, \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} h(t_n)\right],$$

and hence by (3.20) and (3.21), we have

$$\left(c + \frac{\epsilon_0}{4}\right)\gamma_n \leq x + x_n \leq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_0}{4}\right) c_0 \gamma_n \text{ for } x \in [-l, l] \text{ and all large } n. \tag{3.28}$$

To prove (3.25), we need to show that the estimate for u obtained by the comparison argument in the proof of Lemma 3.3 can be made uniform in $\tilde{c} \in I_0 := [c + \frac{\epsilon_0}{6}, \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_0}{6}\right) c_0]$.

We now start the examination of the proof of Lemma 3.3. Firstly it is easily seen that the $\epsilon > 0$ in (3.3) can be chosen independent of $\tilde{c} \in I_0$. Next since $\tilde{L} = L_{\tilde{c}}(0)$ has a common upper bound for $\tilde{c} \in I_0$, we can choose $\tilde{l}$ there independent of $\tilde{c}$. It follows that the number T_1 in the proof there, and hence ψ_0 and $T = T(\psi_0)$ are independent of $\tilde{c}$. Therefore $T_0 = T + T_1$ is independent of $\tilde{c}$. We now obtain from (3.8) that, for every $\tilde{c} \in I_0$,

$$u(t + T_0, x) \geq \tilde{V}(x - \tilde{c}t - \tilde{l} - cT_0 + \frac{\tilde{L}}{2})$$

for $t \geq 0$ and $x \in [\tilde{c}t + \tilde{l} + cT_0 - \frac{\tilde{L}}{2}, \tilde{c}t + \tilde{l} + cT_0 + \frac{\tilde{L}}{2}]$. Taking $x = \tilde{c}t + \tilde{l} + cT_0$ we obtain

$$u(t + T_0, \tilde{c}t + \tilde{l} + cT_0) \geq \tilde{V}\Big(\frac{\tilde{L}}{2}\Big) \text{ for } t > 0,\ \tilde{c} \in I_0.$$

Using the earlier notation $\tilde{V} = V_{0,\tilde{c}}$ and $\tilde{L} = L_{\tilde{c}}(0)$, we find that there exists $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{V}\Big(\frac{\tilde{L}}{2}\Big) = V_{0,\tilde{c}}\left(\frac{L_{\tilde{c}}(0)}{2}\right) \geq \beta \text{ for } \tilde{c} \in I_0.$$

Hence, if we take $t + T_0 = \gamma_n$, then

$$\tilde{c}t + \tilde{l} + cT_0 = \tilde{c}\gamma_n + (c - \tilde{c})T_0 + \tilde{l},$$

and

$$u(\gamma_n, \tilde{c}\gamma_n + (c - \tilde{c})T_0 + \tilde{l}) \geq \beta \text{ for all large } n \text{ and all } \tilde{c} \in I_0. \tag{3.29}$$

Due to our choice of I_0, for all large n,

$$\Big\{\tilde{c}\gamma_n + (c - \tilde{c})T_0 + \tilde{l} : \tilde{c} \in I_0\Big\} \supset \Big[\Big(c + \frac{\epsilon_0}{4}\Big)\gamma_n, \Big(1 - \frac{\epsilon_0}{4}\Big)c_0\gamma_n\Big].$$

Thus, in view of (3.28), the required estimate (3.25) follows from (3.29). The proof is complete. □

3.3. The case of vanishing.

We first give a result which does not require $c < c_0$.

Lemma 3.11. *For any $c > 0$, the unique solution (u, h) has the following property:* $\lim_{t\to\infty}\big[\max_{0\leq x\leq h(t)} u(t, x)\big] = 0$ *if and only if* $h_\infty := \lim_{t\to\infty} h(t) < \infty$.

Proof. Suppose $\lim_{t\to\infty}\big[\max_{0\leq x\leq h(t)} u(t, x)\big] = 0$. We first prove that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} h'(t) = 0. \tag{3.30}$$

Since $h'(t) \geq 0$, it suffices to show $\limsup_{t\to\infty} h'(t) \leq 0$. If this is not true, then there exist $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and a sequence $\{t_n\}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = \infty \ \text{ and } h'(t_n) \geq \epsilon_0 \text{ for all } n.$$

By (1.3), we have $u_x(t_n, h(t_n)) = -h'(t_n)/\mu \leq -\epsilon_0/\mu$. Let $w(t, y) = u(t, y + h(t))$ for $t > 0$ and $-h(t) \leq y \leq 0$. Then $w(t, y)$ satisfies $w_y(t_n, 0) \leq -\epsilon_0/\mu$ and

$$\begin{cases} w_t = dw_{yy} + h'(t)w_y + A(y + h(t) - ct)w - bw^2, & t > 0, -h(t) < y < 0, \\ w_y(t, -h(t)) = w(t, 0) = 0, & t > 0, \\ w(0, y) = u_0(0, y + h_0), & -h_0 \leq y \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Since $h'(t)$, $A(y+h(t)-ct)$ and $w(t,x)$ are all bounded in the L^∞ norm, for any fixed $L \in (0, h_0]$, by L^p estimates and Sobolev embeddings, there exist positive constants $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $D > 0$ such that

$$\|w\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2},1+\alpha}([1,\infty)\times[-L,0])} \le D. \tag{3.31}$$

Since $\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\le x\le h(t)} u(t,x)\right] = 0$, necessarily $w(t_n,x)$ converges to 0 uniformly in $[-L,0]$ as $n \to \infty$. By (3.31) and a standard compactness consideration, there exists a subsequence of $\{t_n\}$, still denoted by itself, such that

$$w(t_n,y) \to 0 \text{ in } C^1([-L,0]) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

It follows that $w_y(t_n,0) \to 0$, which is a contradiction to $w_y(t_n,0) \le -\epsilon_0/\mu$. This proves (3.30).

We next show that $h_\infty < +\infty$. Take

$$m := \frac{d\pi}{9\mu}.$$

Due to $\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\le x\le h(t)} u(t,x)\right] = 0$ and (3.30), there exists $T > 0$ such that

$$u(T,x) \le \tfrac{m}{\sqrt{2}} \text{ for } x \in [0,h(T)] \text{ and } h(t) < ct - l_0 \text{ for all } t \ge T.$$

Therefore $A(x-ct) = a_0$ for $t \ge T$ and $x \in [0,h(t)]$, and so

$$\begin{cases} u_t = du_{xx} + a_0 u - bu^2, & t > T, 0 < x < h(t),\\ u_x(t,0) = u(t,h(t)) = 0, & t > T,\\ -\mu u_x(t,h(t)) = h'(t) & t > T. \end{cases}$$

Set

$$\alpha := \frac{d\pi^2}{36h(T)^2},\ \tilde h(t) := h(T)(3 - e^{-\alpha t}),$$
$$\tilde u(t,x) := me^{-\alpha t}\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{x}{\tilde h(t)}\right).$$

A direct calculation gives

$$\tilde u(0,x) \ge m\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right) = \frac{m}{\sqrt{2}} \ge u(T,x) \text{ for } \ 0 \le x \le h(T),$$
$$\tilde u_x(t,0) = 0, \quad \tilde u(t,\tilde h(t)) = 0 \text{ for } t > 0,$$
$$-\mu\tilde u_x(t,\tilde h(t)) = \mu m e^{-\alpha t}\frac{\pi}{2\tilde h(t)} \le \mu m\frac{\pi}{4h(T)}e^{-\alpha t} = \alpha h(T)e^{-\alpha t} = \tilde h'(t) \text{ for } t > 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde u_t - d\tilde u_{xx} - a_0\tilde u + b\tilde u^2\\ = &\left(-\alpha + \frac{\pi x\tilde h'(t)}{2\tilde h(t)^2}\tan(\frac{\pi x}{2\tilde h(t)}) + \frac{d\pi^2}{4\tilde h(t)^2} - a_0 + bme^{-\alpha t}\cos(\frac{\pi x}{2\tilde h(t)})\right)\tilde u\\ \ge &\left(\frac{d\pi^2}{36h(T)^2} - \alpha\right)\tilde u = 0 \text{ for } t > 0, 0 < x < \tilde h(t). \end{aligned}$$

So, by the comparison principle,

$$h(t+T) \le \tilde h(t) = h(T)(3 - e^{-\alpha t}) \le 3h(T) \text{ for } t > 0,$$
$$u(t+T,x) \le \tilde u(t,x) \text{ for } t > 0 \text{ and } 0 \le x \le h(t+T).$$

The first inequality clearly implies $h_\infty < \infty$.

Conversely, suppose $h_\infty < \infty$. Then from Lemma 3.10 we immediately obtain

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\le x\le h(t)} u(t,x)\right]=0.$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

Theorem 3.12. *If* $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t)-ct]<L_*$, *then* $h_\infty := \lim_{t\to\infty} h(t) < +\infty$ *and*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\le x\le h(t)} u(t,x)\right]=0. \tag{3.32}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.11, it suffices to prove (3.32). Denote $H^* := \limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t)-ct]$. If $H^*=-\infty$, then (3.32) follows immediately from Lemma 3.10.

Suppose next $H^*>-\infty$. Fix a constant $L\in(H^*,L_*)$. By Lemma 2.8, there exists $l>-H^*$ large such that $-\mu W'_{l,L}(L)<c$, where $W_{l,L}$ is given in Lemma 2.8. Let $M_1>M$, $L_1>L$, and denote by $\mathcal{V}_c$ the unique positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} dV''+cV'+A(x)V-bV^2=0 \text{ for } t>t_0, -l<x<L_1,\\ V(-l)=M_1,\ V(L_1)=0. \end{cases} \tag{3.33}$$

By continuity, $-\mu\mathcal{V}_c'(L_1)<c$ provided that M_1 is close enough to M and L_1 is close enough to L. We now fix $M_1>M$ and $L_1>L$ so that $-\mu\mathcal{V}_c'(L_1)<c$ holds.

By the comparison principle, there is small $\epsilon_0>0$ such that

$$\mathcal{V}_c(x)>W_{l,L}(x)+2\epsilon_0 \text{ for } x\in[-l,L].$$

By continuity, there is small $\delta>0$ such that

$$\mathcal{V}_{c-\delta}(x)>W_{l,L}(x)+\epsilon_0 \text{ for } x\in[-l,L] \tag{3.34}$$

and

$$-\mu\mathcal{V}'_{c-\delta}(L_1)<c-\delta,$$

where $\mathcal{V}_{c-\delta}$ is the unique positive solution of (3.33) with c replaced by $c-\delta$.

Since $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t)-ct]=H^*<L$, there is $t_0>0$ so that $ct_0>l$ and $h(t)-ct<L$ for all $t\ge t_0$. We now consider the auxiliary problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t=dv_{xx}+cv_x+A(x)v-bv^2, \quad t>t_0, -l<x<L,\\ v(-l)=M,\quad v(L)=0,\\ v(t_0,x)=M, \end{cases} \tag{3.35}$$

which has a unique positive solution $v(t,x;c)$, and by the comparison principle,

$$v(t,x;c)>u(t,x+ct) \text{ for } t>t_0, -l<x<h(t)-ct.$$

Clearly,

$$v(t,x;c)\to W_{l,L}(x) \text{ in } C^2([-l,L]) \text{ as } t\to\infty. \tag{3.36}$$

Therefore, there is $t_1>t_0$ such that

$$W_{l,L}(x)+\epsilon_0\ge u(t_1,x+ct_1) \text{ for } -l\le x\le h(t_1)-ct_1.$$

From (3.34), it follows that

$$\mathcal{V}_{c-\delta}(x)\ge u(t_1,x+ct_1) \text{ for } -l\le x\le h(t_1)-ct_1.$$

We now define

$$\tilde{u}(t,x):=\mathcal{V}_{c-\delta}(x-ct_1-(c-\delta)t)$$

$$\xi_1(t) := ct_1 + (c-\delta)t - l,\ \xi_2(t) := ct_1 + (c-\delta)t + L_1.$$

Then,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \tilde{u}_t & = & d\tilde{u}_{xx} + A(x - ct_1 - (c-\delta)t)u - bu^2 \\ & \geq & d\tilde{u}_{xx} + A(x - c(t+t_1))u - bu^2 \ \text{ for } t>0, x \in (\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t); \end{array}$$

$$\tilde{u}(t, \xi_1(t)) = M_1 > u(t+t_1, \xi_1(t)), \quad t > 0;$$

$$\tilde{u}(t, \xi_2(t)) = \mathcal{V}_{c-\delta}(L_1) = 0, \quad t>0;$$

$$-\mu\tilde{u}_x(t, \xi_2(t)) = -\mu\mathcal{V}'_{c-\delta}(L_1) < c - \delta = \xi_2'(t), \quad t > 0;$$

$$\xi_2(0) = ct_1 + L > h(t_1);$$

$$\tilde{u}(0,x) \geq u(t_1, x) \text{ for } x \in (\xi_1(0), \xi_2(0)).$$

By the comparison principle, we obtain

$$h(t+t_1) \leq \xi_2(t) = ct_1 + (c-\delta)t \text{ for } t > 0,$$

$$u(t+t_1, x) \leq \tilde{u}(t,x) \text{ for } t>0,\ \xi_1(t) < x < h(t).$$

But the first inequality implies $H^* = -\infty$. This contradiction implies that the case $-\infty < H^* < L_*$ cannot happen. The proof is complete. ☐

3.4. **The case of borderline spreading.**

Theorem 3.13. *If* $\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h(t) - ct] = L_*$, *then* $\lim_{t\to\infty}[h(t)-ct] = L_*$ *and*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\leq x\leq h(t)}\left|u(t,x) - V_*(x - h(t) + L_*)\right|\right] = 0. \tag{3.37}$$

Proof. The first conclusion has been proved in Lemma 3.6. It remains to prove (3.37).

For $t > 0$ and $-h(t) < x < 0$, define

$$g(t) := h(t) - ct,\ w(t,x) := u(t, x + h(t)).$$

Let $\{t_n\}$ be an arbitrary sequence satisfying $t_n \to \infty$, and define

$$g_n(t) := g(t+t_n),\ \ w_n(t,x) := w(t+t_n, x).$$

Then, w_n and g_n satisfy (3.11). By the arguments in the proof of Lemma 3.5, there exists a subsequence of $\{w_n\}$, denoted still by $\{w_n\}$ for convenience, and $\alpha \in (0,1)$, such that $w_n \to \hat{w}$ in $C_{loc}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^1 \times (-\infty, 0])$, $g_n'(t) \to 0$ in $C_{loc}^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R})$, and $\hat{w}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial \hat{w}}{\partial t} = d\dfrac{\partial^2 \hat{w}}{\partial x^2} + c\dfrac{\partial \hat{w}}{\partial x} + A(x+L_*)\hat{w} - b\hat{w}^2, & t \in \mathbb{R}^1, -\infty < x < 0, \\ \hat{w}(t,0) = 0, & t \in \mathbb{R}^1, \\ -\mu\dfrac{\partial \hat{w}}{\partial x}(t,0) = c, & t \in \mathbb{R}^1. \end{cases}$$

We claim that

$$\hat{w}(t,x) \equiv V_*(x + L_*). \tag{3.38}$$

We will use an argument from [19] to prove this claim. Arguing indirectly, we assume that (3.38) is not true. Then there exist $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and $x_0 < 0$ such that $\hat{w}(t_0, x_0) \neq V_*(x_0 + L_*)$. By continuity, there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\hat{w}(t, x_0) \neq V_*(x_0 + L_*) \text{ for } t \in [t_0 - \epsilon_0, t_0 + \epsilon_0].$$

We now consider the function

$$\eta(t,x) := \hat{w}(t,x) - V_*(x+L_*) \text{ for } (t,x) \in \Omega_0 := [t_0-\epsilon_0, t_0+\epsilon_0] \times [x_0, 0].$$

Clearly

$$\eta_t = d\eta_{xx} + c\eta_x + \Big(A(x+L_*) - b\big[\hat{w} + V_*(\cdot + L_*)\big]\Big)\eta \quad \text{in } \Omega_0,$$
$$\eta(t,x_0) \neq 0,\ \eta(t,0) = 0 \text{ for } t \in [t_0-\epsilon_0, t_0+\epsilon_0].$$

Therefore we can use the zero number result of Angenent [1] (as stated in Lemma 2.1 of [14]) to conclude that, for $t \in (t_0-\epsilon_0, t_0+\epsilon_0)$, $\mathcal{Z}(t)$, the number of zeros of $\eta(t,\cdot)$ in $[x_0,0]$, is finite and nonincreasing in t, and if $\eta(t,\cdot)$ has a degenerate zero in $[x_0,0]$, then

$$\mathcal{Z}(t_2) \leq \mathcal{Z}(t_1) - 1 \text{ for } t_0-\epsilon_0 < t_1 < t < t_2 < t_0+\epsilon_0.$$

It follows that there can be at most finitely many values of $t \in (t_0-\epsilon_0, t_0+\epsilon_0)$ such that $\eta(t,\cdot)$ has a degenerate zero in $[x_0,0]$. On the other hand, from

$$\hat{w}_x(t,0) = -\frac{c}{\mu} = V_*'(L_*) \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}^1,$$

we see that $x=0$ is a degenerate zero of $\eta(t,\cdot)$ for every $t \in (t_0-\epsilon_0, t+\epsilon_0)$. This contradiction proves (3.12).

Since $\hat{w}(t,x) = V_*(x+L_*)$ is uniquely determined, we conclude that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} w(t,\cdot) = V_*(\cdot + L_*) \text{ in } C^{1+\alpha}_{loc}(-\infty,0]. \tag{3.39}$$

In view of $\lim_{t\to\infty}[h(t)-ct] = L_*$, it follows that, for every $M>0$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{ct-M\leq x\leq h(t)}\big|u(t,x) - V_*(x-h(t)+L_*)\big|\right] = 0. \tag{3.40}$$

Since $V_*(-\infty) = 0$ and by Lemma 3.10,

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\leq x\leq ct-M} u(t,x)\right] = \epsilon(M) \to 0 \text{ as } M\to\infty,$$

we have

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\leq x\leq ct-M}\big|u(t,x) - V_*(x-h(t)+L_*)\big|\right] =: \tilde{\epsilon}(M) \to 0 \text{ as } M\to\infty.$$

Combining this with (3.40), we obtain, for every $M>0$,

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\leq x\leq h(t)}\big|u(t,x) - V_*(x-h(t)+L_*)\big|\right] = \tilde{\epsilon}(M).$$

Letting $M\to\infty$, we obtain (3.37). The proof is complete. □

4. PARAMETERIZED INITIAL FUNCTION AND TRICHOTOMY

Throughout this section, we suppose

$$0 < c < c_0.$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{X}(h_0) := \big\{\phi \in C^2([0,h_0]) : \phi \text{ satisfies (1.4)}\big\}.$$

Fix $\phi \in \mathcal{X}(h_0)$, and for $\sigma > 0$, let (u_σ, h_σ) denote the unique positive solution of (1.3) with initial value $u_0 = \sigma\phi$. We will examine the long-time dynamical behavior of (u_σ, h_σ) as σ varies, and see how the trichotomy described in Theorem 1.1 is realized.

We will say "(u_σ, h_σ) is a vanishing solution", or simply "(u_σ, h_σ) is vanishing", if in Theorem 1.1 case (i) vanishing happens for (u_σ, h_σ). We similarly define the terms "(u_σ, h_σ) is a borderline spreading solution", "(u_σ, h_σ) is a spreading solution", "(u_σ, h_σ) is borderline spreading", and "(u_σ, h_σ) is spreading".

The following result is a direct consequence of the comparison principle.

Lemma 4.1. *(i) If $(u_{\sigma^1}, h_{\sigma^1})$ is vanishing, then for $0 < \sigma \le \sigma^1$, (u_σ, h_σ) is also vanishing.*

(ii) If $(u_{\sigma^1}, h_{\sigma^1})$ is spreading, then for $\sigma \ge \sigma^1$, (u_σ, h_σ) is also spreading.

Denote

$$S_1 := \{\sigma > 0 : (u_\sigma, h_\sigma) \text{ is vanishing}\},\ \ S_2 := \{\sigma > 0 : (u_\sigma, h_\sigma) \text{ is speading}\},$$

and

$$\sigma_* = \begin{cases} \sup S_1, & \text{if } S_1 \neq \emptyset, \\ 0, & \text{if } S_1 = \emptyset, \end{cases} \qquad \sigma^* = \begin{cases} \inf S_2, & \text{if } S_2 \neq \emptyset, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } S_2 = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 4.2. *We always have $\sigma^* \ge \sigma_* > 0$. If $h_0 \ge L(0)$, then $\sigma^* < +\infty$.*

Proof. For any fixed $T > 0$, it is easy to show that

$$\lim_{\sigma \to 0^+} h_\sigma(T) = h_0,\ \lim_{\sigma \to 0^+} \left[\max_{0 \le x \le h_\sigma(T)} u_\sigma(T, x) \right] = 0.$$

Set $m := \frac{d\pi}{9\mu}$ and fix $T > 0$ such that $cT > l_0 + 3h_0$. We can then choose a sufficiently small $\sigma > 0$ such that

$$3h_\sigma(T) < cT - l_0 \text{ and } u_\sigma(T, x) \le \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} m \text{ for } x \in [0, h_\sigma(T)].$$

Set

$$\alpha := d\frac{\pi^2}{36 h_\sigma(T)^2},$$

$$\tilde{u}_\sigma(t, x) := m e^{-\alpha t} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2} \frac{x}{\tilde{h}_\sigma(t)} \right),\ \ \tilde{h}_\sigma(t) := h_\sigma(T)(3 - e^{-\alpha t}).$$

For $0 < x \le \tilde{h}_\sigma(t)$ and $t \ge T$, we have

$$x - ct \le \tilde{h}_\sigma(t) - ct \le 3h_\sigma(T) - cT \le -l_0.$$

Therefore for such t and x, $A(x - ct) = a_0$, and the calculations in the proof of Lemma 3.11 can be repeated to show, by the comparison principle,

$$h_\sigma(T + t) \le \tilde{h}_\sigma(t) \text{ for } t > 0,$$

which implies that (u_σ, h_σ) is vanishing. This proves $\sigma_* > 0$.

The fact $\sigma_* \le \sigma^*$ clearly follows from their definitions and Lemma 4.1.

Finally, if $h_0 \ge L(0)$, then we can find $\sigma > 0$ large enough such that

$$\sigma\phi(x) \ge V_0(x) \text{ for } x \in [0, L(0)].$$

Therefore by Remark 3.8, (u_σ, h_σ) is spreading. It follows that $\sigma^* < +\infty$. □

Theorem 4.3. *There exists $\sigma_0 \in (0, \infty]$ such that*

(i) *(u_σ, h_σ) is vanishing when $\sigma < \sigma_0$;*

(ii) *(u_σ, h_σ) is spreading when $\sigma > \sigma_0$;*

(iii) *(u_σ, h_σ) is borderline spreading when $\sigma = \sigma_0$.*

Proof. For clarity, we divide the proof into three steps.

Step 1. We show that $\sigma_* \notin S_1$.

Arguing indirectly, we suppose that $\sigma_* \in S_1$. Then we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\le x\le h_{\sigma_*}(t)} u_{\sigma_*}(t,x)\right]=0 \text{ and } (h_{\sigma_*})_\infty<\infty.$$

Denote $m=\frac{d\pi}{9\mu}$. Then there exists $T>0$ such that

$$3h_{\sigma_*}(T)<cT-(l_0+1) \text{ and } \max_{0\le x\le h_{\sigma_*}(T)} u_{\sigma_*}(T,x)\le \sqrt{2}m/4.$$

By continuity of solutions with respect on σ, we may choose a small $\epsilon>0$ such that the corresponding solution $(u_{\sigma_*+\epsilon}, h_{\sigma_*+\epsilon})$ satisfies

$$3h_{\sigma_*+\epsilon}(T)<cT-l_0 \text{ and } \max_{0\le x\le h_{\sigma_*+\epsilon}(T)} u_{\sigma_*+\epsilon}(T,x)\le \sqrt{2}m/2.$$

Let

$$\alpha := \frac{d\pi^2}{36h_{\sigma_*+\epsilon}(T)^2}$$

and define

$$\xi(t):=h_{\sigma_*+\epsilon}(T)(3-e^{-\alpha t}),\ \omega(t,x):=me^{-\alpha t}\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{x}{\xi(t)}\right).$$

Then by the arguments in the proof of Lemma 3.11, we have

$$h_{\sigma_*+\epsilon}(T+t)\le \xi(t) \text{ for } t>0.$$

This implies $\lim_{t\to\infty} h_{\sigma_*+\epsilon}(t)<\infty$, and hence $(u_{\sigma_*+\epsilon}, h_{\sigma_*+\epsilon})$ is vanishing, which is a contradiction to the definition of σ_*. Therefore, $\sigma_*\notin S_1$, and Step 1 is completed.

Let us note that by Lemma 4.1, vanishing happens when $0<\sigma<\sigma_*$. If $\sigma_*=+\infty$, then there is nothing left to prove. We suppose next $\sigma_*<+\infty$.

Step 2. We show that $\sigma^*\notin S_2$.

Suppose that $\sigma^*\in S_2$. Then, by the definition of spreading, we have $h_{\sigma^*}(t)-ct\to\infty$ as $t\to\infty$. Fix a constant $\tilde{l}>\max\{h_0, L_*\}$; then there exists $t_0>0$ such that

$$h_{\sigma^*}(t_0)-ct_0>L(0)+\tilde{l}+1.$$

By continuity, there exists a sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$ such that

$$h_{\sigma^*-\epsilon}(t_0)-ct_0>L(0)+\tilde{l}. \tag{4.1}$$

Define

$$w(t,x):=V_0(x-ct-\tilde{l}) \text{ for } t>0 \text{ and } ct+\tilde{l}\le x\le ct+\tilde{l}+L(0).$$

In view of (4.1) and the fact that

$$h_{\sigma^*-\epsilon}(0)=h_0<\tilde{l},$$

we can find t_1 and t_2 such that $0<t_2<t_1<t_0$,

$$h_{\sigma^*-\epsilon}(t_2)-ct_2=\tilde{l},\ h_{\sigma^*-\epsilon}(t_1)-ct_1=\tilde{l}+L(0),$$

and

$$\tilde{l}<h_{\sigma^*-\epsilon}(t)-ct<\tilde{l}+L(0) \text{ for } t\in(t_2,t_1).$$

We are now in a position to repeat the zero number argument in the proof of Lemma 3.2, to deduce that

$$V_0(x-ct_1-\tilde{l})=w(t_1,x)<u_{\sigma^*-\epsilon}(t_1,x) \text{ for } ct_1+\tilde{l}\le x<h_{\sigma^*-\epsilon}(t_1),$$

and

$$h_{\sigma^*-\epsilon}(t_1) = ct_1 + \tilde{l} + L(0).$$

By the comparison principle for free boundary problems, we then deduce

$$h_{\sigma^*-\epsilon}(t) \geq ct + \tilde{l} + L(0) \text{ for } t > t_1,$$

and

$$u_{\sigma^*-\epsilon}(t,x) \geq V_0(x - ct - \tilde{l}) \text{ for } t > t_1,\ x \in [ct + \tilde{l}, ct + \tilde{l} + L(0)].$$

It follows that

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty}[h_{\sigma^*-\epsilon}(t) - ct] \geq \tilde{l} + L(0) > L_*.$$

Hence we can use Theorem 3.9 to conclude that $(u_{\sigma^*-\epsilon}, h_{\sigma^*-\epsilon})$ is spreading, which is a contradiction to the definition of σ^*. Therefore, $\sigma^* \notin S_2$, and Step 2 is done.

By Lemma 4.1, (u_σ, h_σ) is spreading when $\sigma > \sigma^*$. Moreover, for any $\sigma \in [\sigma_*, \sigma^*] \cap \mathbb{R}^1$, (u_σ, h_σ) is not vanishing, nor spreading, so by Theorem 1.1, (u_σ, h_σ) must be borderline spreading.

Step 3. We prove that $\sigma_* = \sigma^*$.

Suppose that $\sigma_* < \sigma^*$. For convenience, we denote

$$(u_*, h_*) = (u_{\sigma_*}, h_{\sigma_*}) \text{ and } (u^*, h^*) = (u_{\sigma^*}, h_{\sigma^*}).$$

(If $S_2 = \emptyset$ and hence $\sigma^* = +\infty$, then we take σ^* an arbitrary number in $(\sigma_*, +\infty)$ in the definition of (u^*, h^*) above.) Then both (u_*, h_*) and (u^*, h^*) are borderline spreading, and so

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}[h_*(t) - ct] = \lim_{t\to\infty}[h^*(t) - ct] = L_*.$$

By the comparison principle,

$$u_*(t,x) < u^*(t,x) \quad \text{for } t > 0,\ 0 \leq x \leq h_*(t) \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$h_*(t) < h^*(t) \quad \text{for } t > 0. \tag{4.3}$$

From the proof of Lemma 2.5, we see that $V_*'(x) > 0$ for $x < -l_0$. Hence we can use (3.39) to conclude that for all large t, say $t \geq t_0 > 0$,

$$u_x^*(t,x) > 0 \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0,\ -2l_0 \leq x - ct \leq -\frac{3}{2}l_0. \tag{4.4}$$

We may also assume that $ct_0 > 2l_0$.

By (4.2) and (4.3), there is small $\tau_0 > 0$ such that

$$u_*(t_0, x - \tau_0) < u^*(t_0, x) \quad \text{for } ct_0 - 2l_0 + \tau_0 \leq x \leq h_*(t_0) + \tau_0$$

and

$$h_*(t_0) + \tau_0 < h^*(t_0).$$

Define

$$\underline{u}(t,x) := u_*(t + t_0, x - \tau_0),$$
$$\xi_1(t) := c(t + t_0) - 2l_0 + \tau_0,\ \xi_2(t) := h_*(t + t_0) + \tau_0.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{u}_t &= d\underline{u}_{xx} + A(x - \tau_0 - c(t + t_0))\underline{u} - b\underline{u}^2 \\ &\leq d\underline{u}_{xx} + A(x - c(t + t_0))\underline{u} - b\underline{u}^2; \end{aligned}$$

$$\underline{u}(0,x) = u_*(t_0, x-\tau_0) < u^*(t_0,x), \quad x \in [\xi_1(0), \xi_2(0)];$$

$$-\mu \underline{u}_x(t, \xi_2(t)) = -\mu \frac{\partial u_*}{\partial x}(t+t_0, h_*(t+t_0)) = h_*'(t+t_0) = \xi_2'(t);$$

$$\underline{u}(t, \xi_2(t)) = 0, \quad t > 0.$$

By (4.2) and (4.4), for $t > 0$,

$$\underline{u}(t, \xi_1(t)) = u_*(t+t_0, c(t_0+t) - 2l_0) < u^*(t+t_0, c(t+t_0) - 2l_0) < u^*(t+t_0, \xi_1(t)).$$

By the comparison principle,

$$\underline{u}(t,x) \le u^*(t+t_0, x) \ \text{ for } t > 0, \ x \in [\xi_1(t), \xi_2(t)]$$

and

$$\xi_2(t) \le h^*(t+t_0) \ \text{ for } t > 0. \tag{4.5}$$

From (4.5) and $\lim_{t\to\infty}[h_*(t) - ct] = L_*$, we obtain

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty}[h^*(t) - ct] \ge \lim_{t\to\infty}[\xi_2(t-t_0) - ct] = L_* + \tau_0 > L_*,$$

which contradicts $\lim_{t\to\infty}[h^*(t) - ct] = L_*$. This completes Step 3, and hence the proof of the theorem. ☐

5. Proof of Theorem 1.2

We will consider the cases $c > c_0$ and $c = c_0$ separately. We start with the easy case $c > c_0$.

Lemma 5.1. *If $c > c_0$, then the unique solution (u,h) of (1.3) is always vanishing.*

Proof. Since $A(x-ct) \le a$, by the comparison principle and [16], there are $t_0 > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $h(t) < (c-\delta)t$ for $t > t_0$. By Lemma 3.10, we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{0\le x\le h(t)} u(t,x)\right] = 0.$$

We may now apply Lemma 3.11 to obtain $h_\infty < +\infty$. Hence (u,h) is vanishing. ☐

We next treat the case $c = c_0$.

Lemma 5.2. *When $c = c_0$, the unique solution (u,h) of (1.3) is always vanishing.*

Proof. We understand that $u(t,x) = 0$ for $x > h(t)$. By the comparison principle and [16], there exists $L > 0$ such that

$$h(t) - ct < L \text{ for } t \ge 0.$$

Denote $v(t,x) := u(t, x+ct)$; then

$$\begin{cases} v_t = dv_{xx} + cv_x + A(x)v - bv^2, & t > 0, \ -ct < x < h(t) - ct, \\ v(t, h(t) - ct) = 0, & t > 0. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 3.10, there exist $t_0 > 0$ and $M_0 > 0$ such that

$$v(t,x) < \frac{a}{2b} \text{ for } t \ge t_0, \ x \in [-ct, -M_0]. \tag{5.1}$$

Let $M = \max\{\|u_0\|_\infty, a/b\}$. Then consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} w_t = dw_{xx} + cw_x + A(x)w - bw^2, & t > t_0,\ -M_0 < x < L, \\ w(t, -M_0) = \dfrac{a}{2b},\quad w(t, L) = 0, & t > t_0, \\ w(t_0, x) = M, & -M_0 \le x \le L. \end{cases} \tag{5.2}$$

Since $w = M$ is a super-solution of the corresponding elliptic problem of (5.2), by a well-known result on parabolic equations (see [24]), the unique solution of (5.2), which we denote by $v^1(t, x)$, is decreasing in t and

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} v^1(t, \cdot) = V^1 \text{ in } C^2([-M_0, L]),$$

with V^1 the unique positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} dV'' + cV' + A(x)V - bV^2 = 0, \quad -M_0 < x < L, \\ V(-M_0) = \dfrac{a}{2b},\quad V(L) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Since $h(t) - ct < L$ for all t, and $M \ge u_0$, and (5.1) holds, by the comparison principle, we have

$$v(t, x) \le v^1(t, x) \text{ for } t \ge t_0,\ -M_0 < x < L.$$

By a simple comparison argument and the strong maximum principle, we see that there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$V^1(x) \le \frac{a}{b} - 2\epsilon_1 \text{ for } x \in [-M_0, L].$$

So, there is $t_1 > t_0$ such that

$$v(t, x) < \frac{a}{b} - \epsilon_1 \text{ for } t \ge t_1,\ -M_0 \le x \le L.$$

Combining this with (5.1), we obtain, for some $\epsilon_2 > 0$,

$$u(t, x) < \frac{a}{b} - \epsilon_2 \text{ for } t \ge t_1,\ 0 \le x \le ct + L. \tag{5.3}$$

Since $c = c_0$, by [12, 7], the problem

$$\begin{cases} dU'' + cU' + aU - bU^2 = 0, \quad -\infty < x < 0, \\ U(0) = 0,\ U(-\infty) = \dfrac{a}{b}, \\ -\mu U'(0) = c \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

has a unique positive solution U_c. Define

$$U_{c,L_1}(x) = U_c(x - L_1).$$

If we choose $L_1 > L$ large enough, then from $U_c(-\infty) = a/b$ we obtain

$$U_{c,L_1}(x) > \frac{a}{b} - \frac{\epsilon_2}{4} \text{ for } x \in (-\infty, L].$$

By continuity, there is sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ such that

$$U_{c-\delta,L_1}(x) > \frac{a}{b} - \frac{\epsilon_2}{2} \text{ for } x \in [0, L],$$

where $U_{c-\delta,L_1}(x) := U_{c-\delta}(x - L_1)$, and $U_{c-\delta}$ is the unique solution of the initial value problem

$$dU'' + (c - \delta)U' + aU - bU^2 = 0,\ U(0) = 0,\ U'(0) = -\frac{c - \delta}{\mu}.$$

Define

$$\tilde{u}(t,x) := U_{c-\delta,L_1}(x - ct_1 - (c-\delta)t),$$
$$\xi_1(t) := ct_1 + (c-\delta)t,\ \ \xi_2(t) := ct_1 + (c-\delta)t + L_1.$$

Then, for $t > 0$ and $\xi_1(t) < x < \xi_2(t)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}_t &= d\tilde{u}_{xx} + a\tilde{u} - b\tilde{u}^2\\ &\geq d\tilde{u}_{xx} + A(x - c(t+t_1))\tilde{u} - b\tilde{u}^2.\end{aligned}$$

By (5.3),

$$\tilde{u}(t,\xi_1(t)) = U_{c-\delta,L_1}(0) > \frac{a}{b} - \frac{\epsilon_2}{2} > u(t,\xi_1(t)) \text{ for } \ t > 0.$$

Obviously,

$$\tilde{u}(t,\xi_2(t)) = U_{c-\delta,L_1}(L_1) = 0;$$
$$-\mu\tilde{u}_x(t,\xi_2(t)) = c - \delta = \xi_2'(t) \text{ for } \ t > 0.$$

If $[\xi_1(0), h(t_1)]$ is not empty, then by (5.3)

$$\tilde{u}(0,x) \geq \frac{a}{b} - \epsilon_2 > u(t_1,x) \text{ for } x \in [\xi_1(0), h(t_1)].$$

Hence we can use the comparison principle to conclude that

$$\tilde{u}(t,x) \geq u(t+t_1,x) \text{ for } t > 0,\ \xi_1(t) < x < h(t_1+t)$$

and

$$\xi_2(t) \geq h(t+t_1) \text{ for } t > 0.$$

We may now use Lemma 3.10 to conclude that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\max_{x\in[0,h(t)]} u(t,x)\right] = 0.$$

Therefore, $h_\infty < +\infty$ (see Lemma 3.11), and vanishing happens. $\square$

REFERENCES

[1] S.B. Angenent, The zero set of a solution of a parabolic equation, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **390** (1988), 79-96.

[2] D.G. Aronson and H.F. Weinberger, Nonlinear diffusion in population genetics, combustion, and nerve pulse propagation, in Partial Differential Equations and Related Topics, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **446**, Springer, Berlin, 1975, pp. 5-49.

[3] H. Berestycki, O. Diekmann, C.J. Nagelkerke and P.A. Zegeling, P. Can a species keep pace with a shifting climate? *Bull. Math. Biol.*, **71** (2009), no. 2, 399-429.

[4] H. Berestycki and L. Rossi, Reaction-diffusion equations for population dynamics with forced speed. I. The case of the whole space, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **21** (2008), no. 1, 41-67.

[5] H. Berestycki and L. Rossi, Reaction-diffusion equations for population dynamics with forced speed. II. Cylindrical-type domains, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **25** (2009), no. 1, 19-61.

[6] J. Bouhours and G. Nadin, A variational approach to reaction-diffusion equations with forced speed in dimension 1, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **35** (2015), no. 5, 1843-1872.

[7] G. Bunting, Y. Du, K. Krakowski, Spreading speed revisited: Analysis of a free boundary model, *Networks and Heterogeneous Media*, **7** (2012), 583-603.

[8] Y. Du, Order Structure and Topological Methods in Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations, Vol. 1 Maximum Principle and Applications, *World Scientific Publishing*, 2006.

[9] Y. Du, Spreading profile and nonlinear Stefan problems, *Bull. Inst. Math. Academia Sinica*, **8** (2013), 413-430.

[10] Y. Du, Z. Guo and R. Peng, A diffusive logistic model with a free boundary in time-periodic environment, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **265** (2013), 2089-2142.

[11] Y. Du and X. Liang, Pulsating semi-waves in periodic media and spreading speed determined by a free boundary model, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare Anal. Non Lineaire*, to appear.

[12] Y. Du, Z. Lin, Spreading-vanishing dichotomy in the diffusive logistic model with a free boundary, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **42** (2010), 377-405. Erratum: *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **45** (2013), 1995-1996.

[13] Y. Du and B. Lou, Spreading and vanishing in nonlinear diffusion problems with free boundaries, *J. Eur. Math. Soc., to appear.* (arXiv:1301.5373)

[14] Y. Du, B. Lou, M. Zhou, Nonlinear diffusion problems with free boundaries: Convergence, transition speed and zero number arguments, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, to appear. (arXiv:1501.06258)

[15] Y. Du, L. Ma, Logistic type equations on $\mathbb{R}^N$ by a squeezing method involving boundary blow-up solutions, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **64** (2001), 107-124.

[16] Y. Du, H. Matsuzawa, M. Zhou, Sharp estimate of the spreading speed determined by nonlinear free boundary problems, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **46** (2014), 375-396.

[17] F. J. Fernandez, Unique continuation for parabolic operators. II, *Comm. Part. Diff. Eqns.*, **28** (2003), 1597-1604.

[18] R. A. Fisher, The wave of advance of advantageous genes, *Ann. Eugenics*, **7** (1937), 335-369.

[19] H. Gu, B. Lou, M. Zhou, Long time behavior for solutions of Fisher-KPP equation with advection and free boundaries, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **269** (2015), 1714-1768.

[20] A.N. Kolmogorov, I.G. Petrovski, N.S. Piskunov, A study of the diffusion equation with increase in the amount of substance, and its application to a biological problem, *Bull. Moscow Univ. Math. Mech.*, **1** (1937) 1-25.

[21] C. Lei, Z. Lin and Q. Zhang, The spreading front of invasive species in favorable habitat or unfavorable habitat, *J. Differential Equations*, **257** (2014), no. 1, 145-166.

[22] B. Li, S. Bewick, J. Shang and W. Fagan, Persistence and spread of a species with a shifting habitat edge, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, **74** (2014), no. 5, 1397-1417.

[23] R. Peng and X.-Q. Zhao, The diffusive logistic model with a free boundary and seasonal succession, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **33** (2013), no. 5, 2007-2031.

[24] D. Sattinger, Monotone methods in nonlinear elliptic and parabolic boundary value problem, *Indiana Univ. Math. J*, **21** (1972), 979-1000.

[25] M.X. Wang, The diffusive logistic equation with a free boundary and sign-changing coefficient, *J. Differential Equations*, **258** (2015), 1252-1266.

[26] P. Zhou, D.M. Xiao, The diffusive logistic model with a free boundary in heterogeneous environment, *J. Differential Equations*, **256** (2014), 1927-1954.